国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要
第 14 号（平成 22 年）

Journal of the International College
for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies
Vol. XIV, 2010

Māyopamādvayavāda versus Sarvadharmāpratiṣṭhānavāda: A Late Indian Subclassification of Madhyamaka and its Reception in Tibet

Orna Almogi

Māyopamādvayavāda versus Sarvadharmāpratiṣṭhānavāda: A Late Indian Subclassification of Madhyamaka and its Reception in Tibet*

Orna Almogi

1. Introductory Remarks

In a recent publication I briefly touched upon the issue of subclassifications of Madhyamaka, and in particular the rather unfamiliar subclassification into Māyopamādvayavāda—or the "strand which maintains that [phenomena] are one, inasmuch as they are like illusions" (*sgyu ma lta bu gnyis su med par smra ba*, also known as *sgyu ma lta bur 'dod pa:* **māyopamamata* or *sgyu ma rigs grub pa*; henceforth Māyopamavāda: sGyu ma lta bur smra ba)—and Sarvadharmāpratiṣṭhānavāda—or the "strand which maintains that all phenomena have no substratum whatsoever" (*chos thams cad rab tu mi gnas par 'dod pa*, or simply *rab tu mi gnas pa*; henceforth Apratiṣṭhānavāda: Rab tu mi gnas par smra ba). There I identified the eleventh-century Tibetan scholar Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po (henceforth Rong zom pa) as a proponent of Apratiṣṭhānavāda, and argued that his philosophical stance on various issues can only be understood within the framework of this strand of Madhyamaka.[1] However, since a thorough examination of the nature of this subclassifica-

* I would like to express my thanks to Prof. Dorji Wangchuk (University of Hamburg) for his useful comments and suggestions and for helping to solve numerous problems concerning both philological and philosophical matters. Thanks are also due to Prof. Harunaga Isaacson (University of Hamburg) for his suggestions and comments regarding some doubtful Sanskrit titles, names and terms. I would also like to thank Philip Pierce (Nepal Research Centre, Kathmandu) for proofreading my English and for his comments in terms of both style and contents.

1 See Almogi 2009: 39–41 & 226–231.

tion was beyond the scope of my study, I announced then that it would be dealt with elsewhere, having left numerous questions open. In the present paper I shall therefore make a first attempt to give some answers, by taking up where I left off, and so addressing some of the main problems or ambiguities connected with this particular subclassification of Madhyamaka, while also briefly touching upon the Tibetan controversy surrounding it. However, I should perhaps concede from the very outset that while I was preparing this article for publication it became increasingly clear that I have just barely managed to scratch the surface and that there is still a long way to go before we can fully understand this division of Madhyamaka in general, and Madhyamaka in Tibet during the eleventh to thirteenth centuries in particular.

2. The Origin of the Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda Divide

It is well known that both ways of subclassifying Madhyamaka—that is, the division into Sautrāntika-Madhyamaka and Yogācāra-Madhyamaka prevalent during the early propagation of Buddhism in Tibet and the division into Svātantrika-Madhyamaka and Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka prevalent during the later propagation period—were attempts made by Tibetan scholars to systematically define and differentiate the various strands of Madhyamaka found in Indian sources. Although in both cases the two subclasses were defined on the basis of accurate observations and have become standard in Tibet, they do not—as has been pointed out by several scholars—seem to have existed as such in India, and a characterisation of them is not without its problems. In fact, the only explicit and clear-cut division into two branches of Madhyamaka found in Indian sources seems to be that into Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda—for all its having often been criticised by a number of Tibetan scholars.[2] It is perhaps important to

2 Among the Tibetan critics were rNgog lo tsā ba, Gro lung pa, and Tsong kha pa

briefly note here that earlier Tibetan scholars such as rNgog lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab (1059–1109?) criticised this subclassification as having been made on the basis of differences in the establishment of the absolute level—criticism that would be repeated by several later scholars. Other Tibetan scholars, such as sTag tshang lo tsā ba Shes rab rin chen (b. 1405), defending this subclassification, pointed out several Indian sources in which it is found. Some of these sources have already been noted by modern scholars, such as David Seyfort Ruegg; they include the *Tattvaratnāvalī* of Advayavajra (11th cent.), the **Paramārthabodhicittabhāvanākrama* ascribed to a certain Aśvaghoṣa/Śūra, and Candraharipāda's (11th cent.) **Ratnamālā*.[3] One may add here Jñānavajra's (11th cent.?) **Tattvamārgadarśana*, several other works by Advayavajra, the **Guruparamparākramopadeśa* by the latter's disciple Vajrapāṇi (11th cent.), and perhaps also the *bKa' gdams bu chos* ascribed to Atiśa (982–1054). As most of these works can be dated with certainty to the eleventh century, it could well be that this is also when this division of Madhyamaka came into vogue, and that too, probably in circles of scholars belonging to the Madhyamaka-Vajrayāna synthesis.

Interestingly, most of these sources present doxographical schemes that include these two strands of Madhyamaka. Both Candraharipāda's **Ratnamālā* and the *bKa' gdams bu chos* divide Mahāyāna into four schools, namely, Sākāravāda and Nirākāravāda (subdivisions of Yogācāra), and Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda (subdivisions of Madhyamaka). Jñānavajra's **Tattvamārgadarśana*, following along similar lines, divides the Mahāyāna into five schools, including, in addition to the four just mentioned, the Sautrāntikas. Likewise, Vajrapāṇi, in his **Guruparamparākramopadeśa*, splits the Mahāyāna (in conformity with Advayavajra's *Tattvaratnāvalī*,

and his followers, to mention only some. Concerning this group and related Tibetan critics, along with references to their works, see Seyfort Ruegg 2000: 32–35.

3 See Seyfort Ruegg 2000: 34.

upon which it comments) into two strands, the Causal Vehicle of Characteristics and the Resultant Adamantine Vehicle (for which strands, however, Advayavajra employs the terms *pāramitānaya* and *mantranaya*). He further divides the Causal Vehicle of Characteristics into three schools: Sautrāntika (regarded by him as inferior), Yogācāra (regarded by him as mediocre), and Madhyamaka (regarded by him as superior). He then goes on to divide Yogācāra into Sākāravāda and Nirākāravāda, and Madhyamaka into Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda. I shall return to these doxographical schemes below, where they will be discussed in somewhat more detail, but this brief mention of them here should suffice to demonstrate that the Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda divide featured prominently in some Indian masters' systematic presentations of doxographical schemes.

Concerning the division of Madhyamaka into Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda, Seyfort Ruegg has remarked that similar terminology was employed in early Tibetan works, such as sKa ba dPal brtsegs's *lTa ba'i rim pa'i bshad pa* (=*lTa ba'i rim pa'i man ngag snang ba bcu bdun*), though in a different sense.[4] Indeed, my preliminary examination of this work, and several early works by the Tibetan scholar dPal dbyangs, leads me to believe that in no case do the terms *sgyu ma lta bu* and *rab tu mi gnas pa* (with variants such as *mi gnas pa* and *gnas med pa*, or the term *rten med* (*pa*), again a rendering of *apratiṣṭhāna*)[5] refer to two different branches of Madhyamaka, but are apparently used, rather, to refer to the same thing, namely, the nonexistence of phenomena as real entities. Nonetheless, it appears that at least in some (Tibetan) sources, *sgyu ma lta bu* was used to describe phenomena while establishing the conventional level, and *rab tu mi gnas pa* to describe phenomena while establishing the ultimate level,

---

4 Seyfort Ruegg 1981: 58–59, n. 174; Seyfort Ruegg 2000: 34, n. 60.

5 On these and similar terms, see Almogi 2009: 231.

which may, however, reflect the Apratiṣṭhānavāda position.[6]

3. Discussions in Indian Sources

In the following I shall present—by way of either citation or summary—several passages from Indian sources in Tibetan translation in which the Māyopamavāda—Apratiṣṭhānavāda division of Madhyamaka is discussed.[7]

---

6 See the *Thugs rje spyan thag gi gnas*—the first of five short texts (*lung*) found in the *mDo rgyud rtogs pa'i sgron ma* discovered by Nyang ral (and said to have been translated by Padmasambhava and Vairocana)—where it is stated (P, 246b4; not found in D; S, vol. 44: 573.18–19):

The Muni stated that
It is in reliance on the two truths
That the illusory [versus] the substratumless [nature of phenomena] has been taught.

bden pa gnyis la rab brten nas ¦
sgyu ma rab tu mi gnas pa ¦
nges par bden [=bstan?] *zhes thub pas gsungs* ¦ .

Similarly, the *gSang sngags nges par byed pa'i don*, the fourth text in the *mDo rgyud rtogs pa'i sgron ma*, while apparently emphasising the indivisibility of the two truths from the point of view of Mantrayāna, provides as one [speculative] etymology of the word 'mantra' the following (P, 252b3–4; S, vol. 44: 585.19–586.1):

[The syllable] *ma* [means that phenomena are] like dreams [or] illusions;
[The syllable] *tra* [means that] they have no substratum, [but that they nevertheless] appear;
Seeing that the [two] meanings [of phenomena as being like] illusions and [as] having no substratum
Are indivisible is the meaning of 'mantra.'

ma ni rmi lam sgyu ma bzhin ¦
tra ni de la gnas med gsal ¦
sgyu ma rab tu mi gnas don ¦
dbyer med mthong ba gsang sngags don ¦.

7 All Tibetan texts of the Indian and Tibetan sources cited or summarised in the present study—except for the long passage from Jñānavajra's **Tattvamārgadarśana*, of which merely the main points have been summarised—are provided in the appendix.

Tellingly, all authors cited seem to be Apratiṣṭhānavādins, inasmuch as in all cases the Apratiṣṭhānavāda position is presented as doxographically higher, whereas the Māyopamavāda position is vehemently criticised.

(a) Aśvaghoṣa/Śūra

The **Paramārthabodhicittabhāvanākrama* is a short versified work that has been ascribed to Aśvaghoṣa (or Śūra) and was translated by Padmākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po. It has the characteristics of a doxography and briefly describes and refutes the philosophical positions of the non-Madhyamaka Buddhist systems. The work seeks to examine 'the nature of the mind, that is, reality which is bliss' (*sems nyid bde ba'i de nyid*) by employing the so-called tetralemma analysis (spelled out, for example, in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* 1.1). The two kinds of Madhyamaka systems presupposed by it are obviously Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda, although these terms are not used. For Māyopamavāda can be described as the position, so described there, according to which phenomena, when not analysed, impinge on the subject as 'mere illusions,' and when analysed, can be shown to be indeed deceptive. And Apratiṣṭhānavāda can likewise be described as a position according to which the true nature of phenomena is that they lack a substratum; moreover, although this nature is expressed by terms such as 'emptiness,' emptiness itself is empty, and although it can be illustrated by means of analogies such as 'like an illusion,' it is actually not an object susceptible of illustration. The text argues that the very terms employed to designate the various phenomena do not themselves exist, and that in fact there is nothing to be eliminated. According to it, not perceiving any phenomena constitutes awakening. One important difference that the author seems to see between Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda concerns the method of gaining access to true reality. For the former, true reality is attestable in the form of some kind of affirmation, whereas for the latter it is not. It is

argued, from the second point of view, that the logical fallacies that necessarily result from any affirmation would be subsumable under the fallacies resulting from the postulation of one of the four extremes (i.e., here, existence, nonexistence, both, or neither). The author thus suggests that because Māyopamavāda resorts to some kind of affirmation it cannot defend itself against the charge of positing one or the other of the extremes.[8]

If [one assumes that] the fallacies [incurred by] all affirmations
Are subsumable under these (i.e. the fallacies of maintaining one of the four extreme positions],
Then [Māyopamavāda] is deluded, inasmuch as [it on the one hand accepts phenomena] in a non-analytical and naive manner,
[And on the other,] based on analysis, [it affirms that their true nature] is mere illusion. (1)
Even those [who maintain that] mind [partakes of] an aspect of illusion
And [that] awakening, too, is like an illusion,[9]
Are not [able to] see the verbally inexpressible
Freedom from manifoldness, namely, Mañjuśrī (i.e. in his definitive, 'ontological' sense). (2)
The illusory [nature proposed by you can]not [be expressed in terms of] mere illusion.
If it [could] be, it would not be [logically] attestable.

---

8 **Paramārthabodhicittabhāvanākrama* (P, 18a6–b4; D, 16a3–7; S, vol. 64: 46.8–47.3).

9 These two lines also occur within a longer passage of citations in Rong zom pa's *Rang byung ye shes* (121.12–18), *dKon cog 'grel* (199.5–11), and *Theg tshul* (447.11–15). In the *Rang byung ye shes*, the source indicated is a certain *Māyājālatantra* (*sGyu 'phrul drwa ba'i rgyud*).

If it were attestable, it would follow
That other (i.e. non-Buddhist) systems, too, [would be propounding the same] doctrine of illusionism.
Therefore the nature of illusion is [such that]
It is not expressible through [statements such as] "It is like an illusion." (3)
Nonetheless, the Compassionate One (i.e. the Buddha),
Resting [on the scheme of] the two modes of reality,
Proclaimed the [doctrine of] no-self, [which is like] a lion's roar,
In reliance on the conventional [mode of] reality. (4)
*Apratiṣṭhāna-Madhyamaka is illustrated
Through the different modes of the various vehicles,[10]
[Namely,] by means of synonymous terms such as 'emptiness'
[And by] numerous analogies, such as 'being like illusions.' (5)
[But] although [an attempt can be made] to illustrate [true reality, it is] not an object [susceptible] of illustration.
There is nothing whatsoever to be eliminated with regard to it.
Given that [it] is empty, emptiness, too, is empty.
In this [dimension] there are neither *buddha*s nor sentient beings. (6)
Self and other, phenomena [as they] appear and [as they] exist,
Release and bondage are mere names.
[But] names [ultimately] do not exist either.
Everything resembles space. (7)
Thus, when phenomena are not perceived,
[That very] non-manifestation or non-perception is [considered to be] perceiving Mañjuśrī.[11]

---

[10] On the notion of various vehicles, see Wangchuk 2007: 118–119, where references to Indian and Tibetan sources are provided.

[11] On the notion of knowing or perceiving nothing being the correct seeing, see MacDonald 2009.

[In this way one] crosses the ocean of *saṃsāra*,
An existence [subject to] birth and dying. (8)

(b) Candraharipāda

As I have pointed out elsewhere, Candraharipāda—a Kāśmīri master from whom Rin chen bzang po (958–1055) and rNgog lo chung Legs pa'i shes rab (b. 10th cent.) received a number of Tantric initiations[12]—in his *Ratnamālā divides Buddhist thought up into seven schools, namely, into Vaibhāṣika, Sautrāntika, Pratyekabuddha, Sākāra[vāda], Nirākāra[vāda], Māyopama[vāda], and Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda].[13] Since Candraharipāda's treatment of the schools is rather unsystematic—the work merely consisting of a collection of verses cited from or inspired by various Buddhist treatises—it is quite difficult to determine from it exactly what he conceives the difference between the positions of Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda to be. I shall, however, quote a few verses that are revealing in this regard. The position of the Māyopamavāda (presupposing Yogācāra doctrinal elements) seems to be expressed in the following lines of verse, stating that according to this school of thought phenomena, when analysed on the basis of logical reasoning, are found to be free from the extremes of existence and nonexistence, and when not so examined, are found to be of two kinds, either inanimate matter or cognition:[14]

Self-cognition [as the ultimately existent phenomenon], which is the outcome of [Yogācāra's] refutation of the absolute [of the lower

---

12 See Almogi 2009: 180.

13 **Ratnamālā* (P, 66b5–6; D, 68b4; S, vol. 63: 1039.15–16): *sangs rgyas pa ni rnam bdun te* ‖ *bye brag smra dang mdo sde pa* ‖ *rang rgyal rnam bcas rnam med dang* ‖ *sgyu ma rab tu mi gnas pa* ‖. See also Almogi 2009: 311.

14 **Ratnamālā* (P, 69a6–7; D, 71a4; S, vol. 63: 1045.12–14). The meaning of the first two lines is not very clear to me, and the translation provided here is thus tentative.

systems, which they consider] to be conceptually constructed (*brtags pa'i yang dag*),
[Is in fact] an illusory conglomerate.
[Phenomena, when] examined [on the basis of] logical reasoning, turn out to be free from the extremes of existence and nonexistence,
While if [they are viewed] in a non-analytical, naive manner, both inanimate matter (*bems* [*po*]: *jaḍa*) and cognitive [constructs are possible].

A few lines later, Candraharipāda presents a critique of this position—presumably put forward by Apratiṣṭhānavādins. First it is pointed out that the postulation of real entities leads to unwarranted conclusions, and these in turn inevitably lead to disputes, an idea found already in earlier Madhyamaka works such as the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*.[15] Candraharipāda's presentation of the issue seems to make it clear that the main bone of contention between Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda, at least from the latter's standpoint, is not the illusory nature ascribed to phenomena or the description of appearances as illusion-like, but rather the ontological status of this illusory nature or these illusion-like appearances. The Apratiṣṭhānavādins' greatest difficulty seems to be the position attributed to Māyopamavāda according to which the 'illusory [nature of phenomena] is attestable on the basis of logical reasoning' (*sgyu ma rigs pas grub* [*pa*])—which explains why Māyopamavāda has often been designated in Tibetan sources as sGyu ma rigs grub pa. An Apratiṣṭhānavādin would have no difficulty in admitting that all phenomena are illusion-like or illusory in nature insofar as this is accepted as a non-analytical, naive stance as opposed to a verity based on logical reasoning. (The question as to whether a Māyopamavādin would indeed posit that the illusory nature of

[15] *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* 46 (Lindtner 1997: 86 & 175).

phenomena is attestable on the basis of logical reasoning is a separate matter.)

It is argued that a demonstration of the illusory nature of phenomena on the basis of logical reasoning—something which, although not explicitly stated by Candraharipāda, seems, according to other sources cited in the present study, to be the conclusion drawn by the Māyopamavādins, in line with their stance just cited—leads to the logical flaw that phenomena would then be real, and generally questions the logic behind resorting to the term 'illusion' in order to illustrate things that have been shown to be unreal:[16]

> If the illusory [nature of phenomena could] be attested on the basis of logical reasoning—
> Inasmuch as [all phenomena as they] appear [and as they] exist are illusion-like
> And gnoses and *buddha*s [too] are illusory—
> It would follow that [phenomena] are not illusory but [rather] real.
> If [the Māyopamavādins then] said: "No, [that] would not follow, inasmuch it [can] be attested that [phenomena] are illusory,"
> [Then either] the meaning 'logically attestable' would not be applicable,[17]
> [Or] there would be no point in applying the term 'illusion' [in the first place].
> The learned ones hold that such [a position], too,
> Has not transcended the demon of clinging to entities.

The Apratiṣṭhānavāda view is presented in the verses that follow. In the

---

16 **Ratnamālā* (P, 69a8–b1; D, 71a5–6; S, vol. 63: 1045.17–1046.1).

17 Or: "[Then] a logically attestable entity would be unreal."

first few lines, the nature of phenomena is stated to be such that it can be established as neither of the components of such pairs as existent and nonexistent, empty and non-empty, illusory and real, or *saṃsāra* and *nirvāṇa*. Then, in the remaining lines, the notion that there is nothing that can be eliminated or added is underscored, and the view that gnosis does not exist at the stage of a *buddha* is urged.[18]

(c) Jñānavajra

Jñānavajra (fl. 11th cent?), in his **Tattvamārgadarśana*, identifies five philosophical tenets of Mahāyāna, referred to by him as 'bases' or 'fundamentals' (*rten*): Sautrāntika, Sākāravāda, Nirākāravāda, Māyopama-vāda, and Apratiṣṭhānavāda. He discusses these tenets under four points: conduct (*spyod lam*), view (*lta ba*), meditation (*bsgom pa*), and flaws (*skyon*), and provides lengthy and detailed descriptions of each of them. But unfortunately the Tibetan translation is very poor, which significantly hinders an understanding of the text. I shall nonetheless attempt to provide here a summary of the main points on the basis of my preliminary reading. First, Jñānavajra states that while there are no differences in regard to the conduct advocated by the above-mentioned five Mahāyāna tenets, there are differences in regard to their views, which he then summarises as follows:[19]

> It is maintained that the five [tenets] do not differ in regard to the conduct during these three phases (i.e. preparatory, actual, and posterior phases of conduct), but that there are differences in regard to

---

18 The verses proclaiming that there is nothing to be eliminated or added and those dealing with the question concerning the existence of gnosis at the stage of a *buddha* have been translated and critically edited in Almogi 2009: 311–314 & 436–437, respectively.

19 **Tattvamārgadarśana* (P, 148a5–8; D, 133a7–b2; S, vol. 41: 356.7–12).

[their] views. [Their positions in regard to all] three—preparatory, actual, and posterior [phases of conduct are as follows]: Sautrāntika holds to [the notion of] dependent arising. Sākāra[vāda] holds to [the existence of] mental images. Nirākāra[vāda] holds to [the existence of] 'good conception' (i.e. pure cognition). Māyopama[vāda] holds that [phenomena] are like illusions. Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda maintains that] although [this] is [the case on] the conventional level, [it] is not [so on] the absolute level. [It] holds that [on the conventional level they] are unreal appearances, like a dream. [But] regarding the absolute level they take no stand. The other [tenets] take positions in regard to the absolute.

Jñānavajra's discussion of the views of the two Madhyamaka systems can be tentatively summarised as follows:[20] The Māyopamavādins reject the positions of both Sākāravāda (i.e. here clearly Satyākāravāda, which maintains the existence of true images) and Nirākāravāda (which maintains the nonexistence of images), asserting that it is neither the case that images are true nor that there are no images, but rather that images are like illusions, which, like any other phenomena, are impermanent on account of being momentary, but at the same time continuous (*skad cig gis mi rtag la rgyun du gnas*), that is, in terms of their mode of appearance. Therefore, according to them, on the absolute level images, when analysed, are unattestable; still, the illusions are true, since otherwise experiencing happiness or suffering would be fictitious (*brdzun*), and it would then be pointless to strive for Buddhahood, while the four *buddha*-Bodies for their part would not exist either. In support they refer to Buddhaguhya who, according to them, claimed to have shown, on the basis of logical reasoning,

[20] The summary presented here is based on **Tattvamārgadarśana* (P, 160a5–162b5; D, 143b3–145b4; S, vol. 41: 382.3–387.8).

that the physical Bodies are like illusions [resulting from] residual impressions (*bag chags*); and Kamalarakṣita, who maintained that 'these' (i.e. the non-establishment of images and their being established as illusions?) reflect the state of meditative absorption and the post-meditative state, [respectively]. They also refer to the position of others according to which the physical Bodies appear to sentient beings without any intervening conceptualising.

The Apratiṣṭhānavādins reject all previous positions, asserting that all of them merely apply to the conventional level, while arguing that in the case of the absolute level neither negative determination (*vyavaccheda: rnam par bcad pa*) nor positive determination (*pariccheda: yongs su gcod pa*) is valid. They, too, are said to resort to the 'four great syllogisms' (*gtan tshigs chen po bzhi*) of Madhyamaka. Only three of them, however, are identical with those of other systems, while the fourth one is called the 'non-establishment of the objects of knowledge and the knower' (*shes bya shes byed ma grub pa*).[21] They first set about refuting the charge that they advocate annihilationism, arguing that all the entities that the Māyopama-vādins claim exist on the absolute level as illusions—namely, the mind in its true nature, emptiness, the perfection of insight, and the *dharmakāya*—are

[21] Jñānavajra uses here the rather late collective term *gtan tshig chen po bzhi*, which became very popular among Tibetan Mādhyamikas. For a number of references to this collective term (including in the *Madhyamakārthasaṃgraha* by the later Bhāviveka/Bhavya and the *Bodhimārgapradīpapañjikā* ascribed to Atiśa), see Mimaki 1982: 212, n. 547 (I thank Dr. Anne MacDonald (University of Vienna), for pointing out this reference to me). Of the commonly known four great syllogisms, the Apratiṣṭhānavādins are said by Jñānavajra to make use of '*vajra* slivers/fragments' (*rdo rje gzegs ma: vajrakaṇa*), 'negation of arising in terms of the four limits' (*mu bzhi skye ba 'gog pa: catuṣkoṭyutpādapratiṣedha*), and 'being free from the one and the many' (*gcig dang du ma dang bral ba: ekānekaviyoga*), but to replace 'dependent arising' (*rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba: pratītyasamutpāda*) with 'non-establishment of the objects of knowledge and the knower' (*shes bya shes byed ma grub pa*).

in fact merely conventional [phenomena resulting from] dependent arising. Since the Apratiṣṭhānavādins accept that phenomena on the conventional level are mere illusions, they cannot be accused of annihilationism when they reject the Māyopamavādins' postulation that these illusions are true on the absolute level. After presenting their application of the four great syllogisms to establish their case, Jñānavajra highlights some of the points of disagreement between the two branches, in the form of objections and replies. The Apratiṣṭhānavādins, having no theses in regard to the absolute, refute the Māyopamavādins' postulations concerning the absolute by means of a series of *reductiones ad absurdum* (*prasaṅga*). The objection posed by the Māyopamavādins that if, on the conventional level, phenomena are illusions, it would follow that it would be no use striving for Buddhahood, [because then even an ordinary being would have access to the true nature of phenomena], is rejected by arguing that even if one accepts the Māyopamavādins' postulation regarding the absolute, it need not be equally applicable to the conventional [since the distinctive features of individual phenomena are still retained on the conventional level]: just as the functions of water and fire are different and the sensations of bliss and suffering are different, so are *saṃsāra* and *nirvāṇa*, and thus there is no problem in accepting the *dharmakāya, svābhāvikakāya*, and the two *rūpakāya*s as conventional phenomena.

In what follows, the objections and replies mainly revolves around the Māyopamavādins' critique, and in fact rejection, of the Apratiṣṭhānavādins' claim that, unlike the Māyopamavādins, who attempt to establish the absolute in the form of a positive determination, they, in their refusal to formulate either a negative or a positive determination, have no thesis in regard to the absolute. First, in an allusion to the fourth syllogism applied by the Apratiṣṭhānavādins, the Māyopamavādins pose the question whether their claim that they have no proof (*shes byed*) refers to the absolute or to the conventional level, to which the Apratiṣṭhānavādins

reply that in regard to the absolute they have no thesis, and therefore they need no proof, while in regard to the conventional neither a proof (*shes byed*) nor something to be proven (*shes bya*) would make any difference in view of the continuum nature of phenomena, which is characterised by momentariness. Then they go on to rebuff the next possible critique—that if they put forward neither a proof nor something to be proven, they are propagating nihilism—by arguing that since they have nothing to postulate they cannot be accused of being nihilist, any more than space can be accused of any fault. The Māyopamavādins then confront the Apratiṣṭhānavādins with the following critique: You claim that neither a negative nor a positive determination can be achieved. This negatively determining the fault of nihilism, however, amounts to establishing it in the form of a positive determination. So you, too, are left with a positive determination; for you, too, there is something that can be determined on the basis of analysis of the absolute. The Apratiṣṭhānavādins, in reply, continue to insist that their attempting neither a negative nor a positive determination in regard to the absolute means that they have no thesis, and accuse the Māyopamavādins, in their own attempt to establish the absolute by formulating a positive determination, of wrongly concluding—having found fault with the Apratiṣṭhānavādins' analysis of the conventional—that the Apratiṣṭhānavādins have come to a negative determination on the conventional level, which, as in their own case, would naturally result in a positive determination on the absolute level. The Apratiṣṭhānavādins, however, claim that, on the basis of their analysis of the conventional level, they merely establish that there is nothing to be established on the absolute level; they do not make any assertions regarding the absolute, as the Māyopamavādins do. The Māyopamavādins retort that the positive determination applied by the Apratiṣṭhānavādins to the conventional level cannot, in that case, be established[22] on that level, with which observation the Apratiṣṭhānavādins agree. Consequently the Māyopamavādins enquire

whether this non-establishment of a positive determination can be determined, and argue that if it can, whether in the form of either a positive or negative determination, then the Apratiṣṭhānavādins too, like the Māyopamavādins, would be bound by such a determination, while if they reject both negative and positive determinations, they would never be able to prove anything, as nothing can be proven without a proof. In response, the Apratiṣṭhānavādins claim that they negatively determine what is postulated by the Māyopamavādins regarding the absolute level, disproving it by an analysis of the conventional level, and that this refutation is established on the conventional level. Both positive and negative determinations eventually cease being compelling or come to a natural standstill (*rang zhi ba*)—in other words, become redundant—on the conventional level, and thus no 'excluder' (*sel byed*) need be proposed by them for the absolute level. The expressions 'not affirmed' and 'absolute level,' they argue, refer to nothing but this state of affairs, and can be regarded as conventional, inasmuch as one cannot avoid expressing them. They agree that what is to be established (*ci 'grub*) is the absolute, and further, that on the conventional level that which is indeterminate (*ci yang ma yin pa*) is transient, being, like a river, an undisrupted chain of moments.

The Māyopamavādins, in a last attempt to point out further fallacies in the Apratiṣṭhānavādins' position, ask whether the latter's non-postulation of any thesis—which is based on the 'coming to a standstill' of the negative determinations set forth by the Māyopamavādins and their own setting forth of positive determinations (considered by themselves as valid)—has come about in the form of some negative determination or not. If not, then they submit that it must be on the basis of some positive determination, for otherwise they would incur the fault of postulating a third alternative

[22] P reads *grub pa ma*, D reads *grub pa man* (P, 162a5; D, 145a5; S, vol. 41: 386.7). The text should clearly read either *grub pa min* or, perhaps better, *grub pa med*, as in the immediately following sentence.

(*phung po gsum pa'i skyon*). They go on to ask whether, if it has come about in the form of some negative determination, the determinant (*gcod byed*) has arisen from some other determinant or from itself, and argue that neither can be the case. This, too, is rejected by the Apratiṣṭhānavādins, who counter with the following examples: Seeing and hearing exist due to the existence of objects that are respectively visible forms and audible sounds, and if there were no such objects, the sense faculties would induce neither seeing nor hearing, and thus if these conditions were not present the sense faculties would naturally disappear. Likewise, as long as fuel has not been spent a fire will keep burning, whereas once it has been, the fire will naturally die away. Thus, they state, there is nothing that can be negatively determined, and hence [phenomena] are by nature devoid of a substratum.

(d) Advayavajra

There are two short versified works ascribed to Advayavajra (alias Avadhūtapāda or Maitrīpa) devoted to an explanation of the terms *māyā* and *apratiṣṭhāna*, namely, the *Māyānirukti* and *Apratiṣṭhānaprakāśa*.[23] Since these two works, extant in both the Sanskrit originals and their Tibetan translations, focus on the meaning of the terms *māyā* and *apratiṣṭhāna* and not on the Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda branches of Madhyamaka, they do not provide information regarding the employment of the two terms by the two branches or the differences between these branches, and thus I shall not discuss them here. In his *Tattvaratnāvalī*, which is a somewhat longer work (also available in both Sanskrit and Tibetan),

---

[23] Sanskrit editions of the *Māyānirukti* and *Apratiṣṭhānaprakāśa* are found in Mikkyō-seiten kenkyūkai [Study Group on Sacred Tantric Texts] (ed.), "Advaya-vajrasaṃgraha: New Critical Edition with Japanese Translation" (3+4). *AICSB* 12, 1990: 313–310 (52–55) and *AICSB* 13, 1991: 259–256 (78–81), respectively; their Tibetan translations are P3078, D2234 and P3079, D2235, respectively.

Advayavajra explicitly refers to both Madhyamaka branches and deals with them briefly.[24] According to him, the Māyopamavādins hold that phenomena, when analysed, are found to be free from the four extremes of existence, nonexistence, both, and neither, and so long as they are not analysed, can be accepted as existing in the manifold ways they appear. They do not see this as contradictory since they consider phenomena to be one, inasmuch as they are like illusions. The Apratiṣṭhānavādins for their part maintain that phenomena are not their various designations, and insist that they do not propagate annihilationism, since according to them phenomena are neither eternal nor are they disrupted, nor are they both or neither of the two. The true nature of phenomena is that they are all devoid of a substratum. I shall treat this brief presentation by Advayavajra in more detail below on the basis of the rather elaborate commentary by his disciple Vajrapāṇi.

Further, in his **Apratiṣṭhānadeśakavṛtti*, Advayavajra briefly presents the view of Yogācāra, only to refute it with the aid of authoritative citations and logical reasoning, both of which he refers to as the great fangs of the lion-like *Apratiṣṭhānavāda-Madhyamaka, which [opponents] cannot withstand (*rab tu mi gnas par smra ba'i dbu ma seng ge lta bu'i lung rigs kyi mche ba ches mi bzad pa*). First, a certain *sūtra* is cited in which five methods of examining phenomena are noted, apparently corresponding to Sautrāntika, Sākāravāda, Nirākāravāda, Māyopamavāda, and Apratiṣṭhānavāda, respectively:[25]

(1) All phenomena exist in the manner they appear, since phenomena, which are rooted in the four elements, exist on the conventional level like illusions.

[24] *Tattvaratnāvalī* (6.12–7.11 (§ III)); Tib. (P, 129a3–b6; D, 118a7–119a1; S, vol. 26: 343.1–344.9).

[25] **Apratiṣṭhānadeśakavṛtti* (P, 234b5–235a5; D, 215a3–b3; S, vol. 26: 1535.7–1536.8).

(2) All phenomena are nothing but mind, since phenomena, variously designated, appear at all times variously as a self or as objects, on the basis of residual impressions implanted in the mind, giving a sense of permanence and continuance as conceptual constructs. On the ultimate level, however, they have no own-nature since they do not exist apart from the mind.

(3) The mind itself has not arisen, since it has neither shape nor colour, nor is it subjected to the three times, nor does it have a periphery or middle.

(4) All phenomena appear in the form of illusions and, like illusions, cannot be established, since all phenomena arise and emerge from causes and conditions.

(5) All phenomena are by nature non-arisen and by nature devoid of a substratum, are free from all extremes associated with actors and actions (? *las dang bya ba'i mtha'*), are beyond the domain of conceptual and non-conceptual, and are primordially free from manifoldness, since all this being the true nature of all phenomena.

This is followed by the following logical argumentation:[26]

> What is the logical reasoning? The extant well-expounded writings of great beings of the past state that as all phenomena have simply arisen in accordance with the mechanism of dependent arising, they are like illusions. Thus, on the ultimate level, the arising from themselves, something else, both, or causelessly is not at all tenable, and so on the ultimate level they are like a 'sky lotus.' This teaching alone is sufficient. If those endowed with the eye of insight would undertake a straightforward, careful examination on the basis of the syllogism of

---

[26] **Apratiṣṭhānadeśakavṛtti* (P, 235a5–8; D, 215b4–6; S, vol. 26: 1536.8–16).

identity (*rang bzhin gyi gtan tshigs: svabhāvahetu*) alone, they [would realise that] in the end nothing attestable [can] be found, and thus it is established that all phenomena are devoid of a substratum.

(e) Vajrapāṇi's **Guruparamparākramopadeśa*

The eleventh-century master Vajrapāṇi, in his **Guruparamparākramopadeśa*, adopts the doxographical scheme of his master Advayavajra found in the *Tattvaratnāvalī*, dividing the entire Buddhist system as follows:[27] The three Vehicles—Śrāvakayāna, Pratyekabuddhayāna, and Mahāyāna—rest on a total of four 'bases' (i.e. tenets), namely, Vaibhāṣika, Sautrāntika, Yogācāra, and Madhyamaka. Śrāvakayāna and Pratyekabuddhayāna follow Vaibhāṣika, which in turn is divided into two, Western Vaibhāṣika and Kāśmīra Vaibhāṣika. Śrāvakayāna is divided into three corresponding to disciples' faculties, namely, dull, mediocre, and sharp. Those with dull and mediocre faculties are said to follow Western Vaibhāṣika, and those with sharp faculties and those following Pratyekabuddhayāna, Kāśmīra Vaibhāṣika. Mahāyāna is first divided into two, namely, Causal *Lakṣaṇayāna and Resultant Vajrayāna. The Causal *Lakṣaṇayāna is then divided into three, again corresponding to disciples' faculties: for those with dull faculties, Sautrāntika; for those with mediocre faculties, Yogācāra; and for those with sharp faculties, Madhyamaka. Both Yogācāra and Madhyamaka are further divided into two, namely, the former into Sākāravāda and Nirākāravāda, and the latter into Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda.

Vajrapāṇi then discusses the total of nine systems introduced by him—three subdivisions of Śrāvakayāna for disciples with dull, mediocre, and sharp faculties (1–3); Pratyekabuddhayāna (4); the three subdivisions of Causal *Lakṣaṇayāna for disciples with dull, mediocre, and sharp faculties,

[27] **Guruparamparākramopadeśa* (P, 184b6–185a3; D, 164b4–165a1; S, vol. 41: 446.10–447.13). The partitioning as found in Advayavajra's *Tattvaratnāvalī* is cited and discussed in Mathes 2007: 548–549.

that is, Sautrāntika (5), Yogācāra with its two subdivisions of Sākāravāda and Nirākāravāda (6–7), and Madhyamaka with its two subdivisions of Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda (8–9)—under four points:[28] discernment (*so sor rtog pa: pratyavekṣaṇa*), meditation (*sgom pa: bhāvanā*), stains (i.e. risks) in meditation [that should be avoided] (*sgom pa'i dri ma*), and view (*lta ba: dṛṣṭi/darśana*).[29]

In his discussion of Māyopamavāda, Vajrapāṇi first cites and comments upon the four lines of verse from Advayavajra's *Tattvaratnāvalī* according to which the Māyopamavādins hold that phenomena, when analysed, are found to be free from the four extremes of existence, nonexistence, both, and neither,[30] and then goes on to comment as follows:[31]

> Now I shall explain the Māyopama[vāda] system:
> [[...]]
> Therefore, it claims [the existence of] a luminous cognition that is like an illusion and free from the four extremes (i.e. of existence, nonexistence, both, and neither). Moreover, it teaches that nirvāṇic phenomena, too, are like illusions [or] like dreams, and that even if there were a phenomenon superior to *nirvāṇa*, it, too, would be like an illusion [or] like a dream.[32] Therefore, the diverse [phenomena] and the mind itself are one insofar as they are like illusions. This is the

---

28 For a further discussion on this notion of four tenets and nine systems, see Rig ral's *bSlab pa gsum gyi rgyan gyi me tog* (393.3ff).

29 **Guruparamparākramopadeśa* (P, 185a3–4; D, 165a1–2; S, vol. 41: 447.14–15): *de ltar na sbyor ba dgu la dbye ba bzhi bzhi ste| so sor rtog pa dang| sgom pa dang| sgom pa'i dri ma dang| lta ba'o||*.

30 The citation has not been translated here, but it is provided in the critically edited text found in the appendix.

31 **Guruparamparākramopadeśa* (P, 189a3–b6; D, 168a7–169a1; S, vol. 41: 456.11–457.19).

32 A similar statement is found in Rong zom pa's *Theg tshul* (447.16–17).

discernment [of Māyopamavāda]. Maintaining [the realisation that] all the various [phenomena] are one insofar as they are like illusions, neither real nor false—like the moon [seen on a body of] water or a reflection in a mirror—is the meditation [of Māyopamavāda]. Attachment to [the extreme of] annihilationism is [considered by it] a stain in meditation [that should be avoided]. Acting for the sake of sentient beings after purifying the [first] five perfections in regard to the three spheres [of actor, act, and recipient] by means of the three non-objectifications—by means, [that is,] of a perfection of insight [that cognises that phenomena] are like illusions—is the view [of Māyopamavāda].[33]

Further, [Apratiṣṭhānavāda] maintains, as follows, that because all phenomena are devoid of a substratum, that which is like an illusion [can]not be established:[34]

> No one has ever seen [phenomena]—
> Be they conspicuous or inconspicuous—as they [really] are.
> Thus although [they] may be expressible in words, [they] are devoid of content,
> Just like [the expression] 'the son of a barren woman.'

[Query:] Is that which is like an illusion something luminous (i.e. a cognitive entity) or is it something other than the mind (*sems*)? [Response:] A phenomenon that is other than the mind is not attested. If it is the mind, on the level where the mind itself [can]not be established, that which is illusion [can]not be established either. Why is that so? Because there is nothing other than the mind itself.

---

33 The employment of the term 'view' here (as in the parallel passage concerning Apratiṣṭhānavāda cited below) is unusual. One would expect a term such as 'conduct' (*spyod pa*), whereas under the first point, where one would indeed expect 'view,' our author uses the term 'discernment.'

34 The source of this verse could not be identified.

> [Perceiving phenomena as being something] like an illusion is the cognition of an injudicious person, [entailing as it does both] false imputation and false depreciation. For example, if a person with diseased eyes looks at the sky, [he] would say, under the influence of his diseased eyes, that a second moon, balls of hair, or the like appear, [thereby] falsely imputing [existence to them]; a judicious person, with his knowledge, on the other hand, would recognise, as soon as [they] appear, that [these phenomena] do not exist, and say that [they] do not exist, [thereby] falsely depreciating [their appearance]. Likewise, saying that illusion-like [phenomena] appear in various [forms] on account of [one's] karma and ignorance is false imputation; and the statement that [they] are like illusions—made on account of a judicious person's aptitude [for recognising these phenomena], as soon as [they] appear, to be empty—is false depreciation.[35] Therefore [Māyopamavāda] rests on the extremes of false imputation and false depreciation.

In his discussion of Apratiṣṭhānavāda, Vajrapāṇi first cites three verses from Advayavajra's *Tattvaratnāvalī*—the first presenting the view that phenomena are found to be free from the four extremes of eternalism, annihilationism, both, and neither[36]—follows with a citation of *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* 5.21 (= *Ratnagotravibhāga* 1.154)[37,38] and then proceeds to expand on them as follows:[39]

---

[35] For the employment of the same analogy (also found in the following passage) by *Madhyamaka-Siṃha, see Almogi 2009: 303.

[36] For a translation and a discussion of these three verses, particularly from the point of view of Mahāmudrā, see Mathes 2007: 551–558.

[37] For further references and a translation of this verse, see Wangchuk 2007: 199–200, n. 11; Almogi 2009: 312.

[38] The citations have not been translated here, but they are provided in the critically edited text found in the appendix.

Furthermore, the position of the Sarvadharmāpratiṣṭhānavāda:
[[...]]
It rests neither on false imputation of existence nor on depreciation into nonexistence. The experiencing of the mind as various appearances is [the result of] dependent origination, and thus [phenomena] are non-arisen. That which is non-arisen appears as if [it] arises, and thus the two—arising and non-arising—are not different [from each other]. Likewise, if one examines, on the basis of logical reasoning, that which appears, [one realises that it] is empty; while that which is empty, unattested, and unable to withstand logical analysis is appearance. That which is empty is nothing but appearance, and appearance is nothing but that which is empty. For example, the appearance of water in a Fata Morgana is empty of water, and the absence of water [in it] appears as water.[40] The two—the water's appearance and the absence of water [in it]—are not different [from each other]. Likewise, an appearance has no own-nature, while that which has no own-nature appears. An appearance and the lack of an own-nature, [which latter means] emptiness, are not different [from each other]. For example, if a bundle of firewood is consumed by fire, [it becomes] one in essence with the fire. Then, once the firewood is exhausted, the fire does not exist [any more]. Likewise, once [the nature of all] the diverse appearances has been established as emptiness, on the basis of logical reasoning, [one realises that] even the nonexistence of entities and emptiness do not subsist.[41] Similarly,

---

39 **Guruparamparākramopadeśa* (P, 189b6–190b5; D, 169a1–b5; S, vol. 41: 457.20–459.21). Compare Mathes 2007: 558–562, where some portions of Vajrapāṇi's treatment of Apratiṣṭhānavāda are cited and translated.

40 For Rong zom pa's employment of this analogy in his *dKon cog 'grel*, see Almogi 2009: 293.

41 For references to similar employment of the analogy of firewood and other fuels,

regarding [appearance and emptiness as] not being different: once [their] being different [can] no [longer] be attested, [their] being identical is no [longer] attestable either. Therefore, [in order to] eradicate other [beings'] attachment or to eliminate false imputation and false depreciation, or in a provisional sense, one speaks [of phenomena] as being empty and non-arisen. Yet, [when] explored by judicious persons, or in a definitive sense, [even] these (i.e. emptiness and non-arising) do not subsist. Negative determinations, positive determinations, false imputation or false depreciation do not subsist either. Attachment, negation and affirmation, and two [separate states of] meditative absorption and post-meditation do neither exist nor subsist. This is the discernment [of Apratiṣṭhānavāda]. The non-[focusing of] attention (or: non-mentation, *yid la mi byed pa: amanasikāra*) that is devoid of false imputation, false depreciation, and attachment [in regard to phenomena] is the meditation [of Apratiṣṭhānavāda]. [To be sure, reaching a state of] total blankness (lit. 'becoming [like] inanimate matter') as a result of holding an annihilationistic view in regard to all [external] objects and [thus no longer] experiencing [phenomena] is [considered by it] a stain in meditation [that should be avoided]. Acting for the sake of sentient beings after purifying the [first] five perfections in regard to the three spheres [of actor, act, and recipient] by means of the three non-objectifications—by means, [that is,] of a perfection of insight [that cognises phenomena] without [succumbing to] false imputation, false depreciation, and attachment—is the view [of Apratiṣṭhānavāda]. For example, when a judicious person with healthy eyes looks at the sky, thanks to his healthy eyes he perceives no balls of hair or the like

see the index in Almogi 2009: 528, s.v. analogies: firewood/fuel and fire & wick, sesame oil, and lamplight.

whatsoever, and [that] judicious person does not engage in false imputation or false depreciation by saying, "[Such objects] exist" or "[Such objects] do not exist." Likewise, since [according to Apratiṣṭhānavāda] the essence of phenomena is that [they] are all non-arisen by nature, and so [can] in no way abide in terms of either existence or nonexistence, [it] in no way rests on false imputation and false depreciation vis-à-vis existence or nonexistence. This is [its] cognition of true reality. The compassion [advocated by both] Māyopama[vāda] and Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda] is an objectless compassion. It is an objectless compassion because [the focusing of one's] attention (or: mentation) is [in this case] without perceiving any phenomena whatsoever.

(f) ***bKa' gdams bu chos*** **ascribed to Atiśa**

The work titled *'Brom ston pa rgyal ba'i 'byung gnas kyi skyes rabs bka' gdams bu chos* (or short: *bKa' gdams bu chos*) is found in the recently published *Jo bo'i gsung 'bum*, though it was very probably not written by Atiśa but rather by some of his direct Tibetan disciples, and perhaps includes input by later followers of his. It is, however, not to be ruled out that the work incorporates notes taken during and after oral instructions given by the master, such as the passage cited here. In its first chapter, relating 'Brom ston's birth as the Brahmin child gSal ba (*dGe ba'i bshes gnyen pa bram ze'i khye'u gsal bar ji ltar skye ba bzhes pa'i le'u*), a similar division of Mahāyāna is found in a passage containing teachings ascribed to Atiśa.[42]

It (i.e. Mahāyāna) has two [schools]: Madhyamaka and Yogācāra. Madhyamaka has two [branches]: Madhyamaka which holds [that

---

42 *bKa' gdams bu chos* (160.9–16).

phenomena] are mere appearances (i.e. *Pratibhāsamātra-Madhyamaka)[43] and Madhyamaka which holds [that phenomena] have no substratum (i.e. *Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda]-Madhyamaka). *Pratibhāsamātra-Madhyamaka establishes that the false appearances are false, and demonstrates this with the aid of the eight illustrations of illusion—dreams and the rest. Furthermore, because the pair [comprising] that which is to be demonstrated and the demonstrator are respectively a deceptive object and subject, they need to be abandoned and yet to be known (or: they need to be known as something to be abandoned). *Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda]-Madhyamaka teaches that *buddha*s may appear or may not appear, but the true nature of all phenomena is [that they] have had no substratum since primordial times,[44] and therefore it is to be accepted and known. Yogācāra has two [branches]: that which postulates that appearances

43 Here 'mere appearance' (*snang ba lta bu: pratibhāsamātra*) is clearly used as synonymous with 'mere illusion,' which latter expression, as we have already seen, is used by some interchangeably with 'like an illusion' (*sgyu ma lta bu: māyopama*) in the context of Māyopamavāda. Of possible relevance is the expression *māyopama-pratibhāsamātra* used by Vāgīśvarakīrti in his *Tattvaratnāvaloka* (142.16–17), also in connection with Madhyamaka. For time constraints I have not been able to look at the matter more closely. However, it should be noted that the expression 'mere appearance' is more commonly associated with Apratiṣṭhānavāda. See, for example, the table presenting Klong chen pa's subclassification of Madhyamaka, which includes the subbranch sNang tsam rab tu mi gnas pa. Moreover, as I have shown elsewhere (Almogi 2009, *passim*), the term 'mere appearance' is central to Rong zom pa's Madhyamaka, which is clearly to be identified as Apratiṣṭhānavāda.

44 This famous line, found in several versions in various sources (see Wangchuk 2007: 78, n. 24), should actually read affirmatively: "It is taught that the true reality of phenomena subsists primordially [as it is]" (*chos rnams kyi chos nyid ye nas gnas par gsungs pas|*). One possibility is that the negative particle is an error introduced later accidentally. It may also be that the author exploited the phrase *ye nas gnas pa* and deliberately intended the negative particle so as to reflect the position of the Apratiṣṭhānavāda.

are true and that which postulates that they are false. From the point of view of *Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda]-Madhyamaka, both of these [positions] are deluded, and yet need to be known.

4. The Reception of the Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda Divide in Tibet

It is impossible to discuss in detail the Tibetan reception of the partitioning of Madhyamaka into Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda within the framework of this article, but I wish to touch upon some of the main issues on the basis of a few examples. As stated above, despite the fact that this division can be traced to Indian sources, it was categorically dismissed by several Tibetan scholars. The first was apparently rNgog lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab (1059–1109?), who with the following two lines in his *sPrings yig* seems to have triggered the Tibetan controversy regarding this subclassification:[45]

> The subclassification of Madhyamaka into the two systems
> Of *Mayādvaya[vāda and] Sarvadharmāpratiṣṭhāna[vāda] instils a sense of wonder [only] among simpletons.

In the centuries that followed, the nature of this division was heatedly debated between those who dismissed it and those who accepted it, particularly as regards whether it was made on the basis of a view concerning the ultimate level, and—related to this—as regards the methods employed by these two branches to establish the ultimate level. Even those who accepted this division held different positions as to its relation to the more familiar division of Madhyamaka—whether Apratiṣṭhānavāda is to be equated with Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka and Māyopa-

---

[45] *sPrings yig* (Kano 2007: 11.5–6):
sgyu ma gnyis med chos kun mi gnas dbu ma yi ||
lugs gnyis rnam 'byed de yang rmongs pa mtshar bskyed yin ||.

mavāda with Svātantrika-Madhyamaka, or whether both should be subsumed under Svātantrika-Madhyamaka.

(a) Deliberations on the Nature of the Division

Those who vehemently rejected the Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda divide seem to have associated it with a postulation regarding the absolute. The situation among those who accepted it seems more complex. As we have seen above, the Māyopamavādins are generally said to hold phenomena to be like illusions, while the Apratiṣṭhānavādins assume no thesis. As we have also seen, the terms 'negative determination' and 'positive determination' play a central role in this connection.

(i) Gro lung pa Blo gros 'byung gnas

Gro lung pa Blo gros 'byung gnas (11th cent.), who clearly followed his master rNgog lo tsā ba in categorically rejecting this distinction, states the following:[46]

> Further, some foolish persons [claim that] there are two Madhyamaka schools, namely, Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda] and Māyopamavāda. [They] claim that Ācārya Śāntarakṣita and others proposed that the illusory [nature of phenomena] is the absolute, and that, having categorically negated (i.e. in the form of a negative determination) the true existence (*bden pa*) imagined by the Substantialists (*dngos po[r] smra ba: vastuvādin*), [these masters went on], on the basis of logical reasoning, [to] affirm a false existence (*brdzun pa*), [in the form of] a positive determination. [This can] in no way be [true, given the following] statement in *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* [63]:[47]

---

46 *bsTan rim chen mo* (437b7–438a3).

47 See Ichigō 1989: 212. Compare the English translation in *ibid.*: 213. See also Mi pham's *dBu ma rgyan 'grel* (216.2–221.3), where variant readings of the verse are

> Therefore these entities
> Have the characteristic of [merely being] conventional [reality].
> If one posits that it (i.e. conventional reality) is the absolute,
> Then what is there that I can do!

[Śāntarakṣita] considered this false existence to be a mere object of perception, and [he also] stated that [what is established in the form of] a positive determination, [of the sort] included among the four [kinds of] affirming negation [employed for] the negation of arising, is false conventional [reality]. If one posits that [a given 'x'], be it existent or nonexistent, is attestable on the basis of logical reasoning, one would be possessed by the great demon of extreme views, and thus remote from the Middle Way. For [Śāntarakṣita also] stated, among other things, that if [one posits] existence, [one would fall into the extreme of] eternalism.

(ii) Phywa pa Chos kyi seng ge

Until recently Phywa pa Chos kyi seng ge's (1109–1169) works have not been accessible, and his positions on various Madhyamaka issues were known of only second-hand, as reported by later Tibetan scholars. Phywa pa has long been considered to have been a Tibetan proponent of Svātantrika-Madhyamaka and a vehement opponent of Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka[48]—an issue, however, beyond the scope of this study. What I merely wish to do here is to present Phywa pa's assessment of the Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda divide (which he clearly does not approve of) as found in his doxographical work entitled *bDe bar gshegs pa dang phyi rol pa'i gzhung rnam par 'byed pa* (henceforth: *gZhung rnam 'byed*). He discusses the issue, in the context of presenting the absolute

---

discussed.

[48] For a brief discussion of Phywa pa's Madhyamaka, see Seyfort Ruegg 2000: 37–41.

truth (or reality) according to the Madhyamaka system, as follows:[49]

> In regard to the absolute truth (or reality), some have claimed that there are two [Madhyamaka] systems (*lugs*), namely, [Māyopamavāda,] which posits that appearances, [things] devoid of true existence, are like illusions (*bden pas stong pa'i snang ba sgyu ma lta bur smra ba*), and [Apratiṣṭhānavāda,] which posits that no true existence (*bden pa*) [positively determinable] in the form of an implicative negation [exists] anywhere [as something] having a substratum. [All] this [amounts to] a foolhardy exposition (*mun sbrul gyi bshad pa*).[50] Regarding the claim that Māyopamavāda is a system different (*lugs gzhan*) from Apratiṣṭhānavāda: (a) Is [Māyopamavāda] a different system because [it] does not accept that [phenomena are] empty of hypostatic existence, or (b) is [it] a different system because [it] accepts that appearances are [positively determinable] in the form of an implicative negation? (a) In the first case, if Māyopamavāda does not accept that [phenomena are] empty of hypostatic existence, this would contradict the fact that it does accept manifold appearances, and thus it would illogically follow that it does not even accept the illusion-like [nature of phenomena]. (b) In the second case, (i) is [Māyopamavāda] different from Apratiṣṭhānavāda because it accepts mere appearances that are [positively determinable in the form of] an implicative negation, or (ii) is [it] different from Apratiṣṭhānavāda because [it] accepts that appearances [that are positively determinable in the form of] an implicative negation are [capable of] withstanding logical analysis (*dpyad bzod*)? (i) In the first case, it

[49] *gZhung rnam 'byed* (65.6–67.2).

[50] The exact meaning of the word *mun sbrul*, often employed in exegetical writings, is not wholly clear. It seems to convey something like tramping in the darkness (*mun*) over places inhabited by poisonous snakes (*sbrul*).

would follow that even Apratiṣṭhānavāda itself would be a different system from Apratiṣṭhānavāda, inasmuch as [it too] accepts mere appearances that are [positively determinable in the form of] an implicative negation. If it did not accept [that], it would follow that it, like the Lokāyata [system, could be accused of postulating the view of] annihilationism, inasmuch as [it would then] depreciate conventional [truth/reality], and inasmuch as it would deny not only what is not apparent, like the latter (i.e. the Lokāyata system), but even deny what is obvious. (ii) In the second case, it would follow that Māyopamavāda, in accepting that these [appearances] are [capable of] withstanding logical analysis and [positively determinable in the form of] an implicative negation, would not[51] be different from the Substantialists.

Again, if it is maintained that Apratiṣṭhānavāda is a system different from [that of] Māyopamavāda, [the questions would be] whether it is a different system (a) because [it] does not accept [that the nature of phenomena is] illusory or (b) because [it] does not accept that the illusory [nature] is capable of withstanding logical analysis? (a) In the first case, [it would mean that Apratiṣṭhānavāda] accepts no conventional [phenomena] at all (i.e. not even one that is illusory in nature), and thus it would follow that Apratiṣṭhānavāda is censurable even by [the standards of] the Lokāyata [system], for whereas the Lokāyata [system] depreciates [only] a portion of the conventional [phenomena] (i.e. those that are not apparent), Apratiṣṭhānavāda would depreciate all conventional [phenomena]. (b) In the second case, it would follow that Māyopamavāda itself would be different from Māyopamavāda, inasmuch as it would accept (i.e. in contrast not only to the Apratiṣṭhānavāda position but also to its own)

[51] The text has no negative particle here, but the logic of the argument seems to call for one.

> that the illusory [nature of phenomena] is capable of withstanding logical analysis. Positing that [it] is capable of withstanding logical analysis [entails] a hypostatic appearance (*bden pa'i snang ba*), and thus the semantics of 'illusory [nature]' would not hold [any longer]. And in positing that appearance is capable of withstanding logical analysis, [Māyopamavāda] would not be [doing anything] different from the Substantialists. Thus no Mādhyamika would consider the illusory [nature of phenomena to be capable of withstanding logical] analysis. There are no differences, then, among the Mādhyamikas, inasmuch as they all accept that the utter unattestability [of phenomena] alone (*cir yang ma grub pa kho na*) is capable of withstanding logical analysis.[52]

(iii) Rog Shes rab 'od

We have seen that the terms negative determination (*vyavaccheda: rnam par bcad pa*) and positive determination (*pariccheda: yongs su gcod pa*) play a great role in the arguments surrounding the two strands of Madhyamaka under discussion. The issue is complex and needs to be

---

[52] This statement of Phywa pa is a very significant one, since he has often been cited by later Tibetan scholars as having maintained that the absolute truth (or reality) is something that is capable of withstanding logical analysis (Seyfort Ruegg 2000: 38, n. 71). Those scholars must have such statements as this one in mind when they reported Phywa pa's position on the absolute truth, which seems to have been a target of ridicule among Tibetan Mādhyamikas. For the general perception is that what is capable of withstanding logical analysis must by definition be something real, which is of course held to be impossible. Obviously for Phywa pa an 'x' can by no means bear the force of Madhyamaka logical analysis, whereas the utter unattestability of 'x' can be said to be immune to Madhyamaka logical analysis, perhaps inasmuch as the utter unattestability of 'x' is what ultimately prevails as true reality. A careful examination of Phywa pa's position, however, would be necessary to come to any definite conclusion.

further investigated, but here I shall merely present Rog Shes rab 'od's (1166–1244) brief explanation of these two terms in connection with the notion of *māyopama* and *apratiṣṭhāna*:[53]

> The second [point], what is to be negated [in the form of] a negative determination, has two [subpoints]: general and specific [ones]. As to the first, [namely,] the characteristics of the general negandum, whatever position one arrives at—after scrutinising on the basis of logical reasoning—according to which there are some features of a true nature (*rang bzhin: svabhāva*), be it [of] existence or nonexistence, is the negandum. If one specifies the negandum [according to the negation applied], there are two: [that which is negated in] a non-implicative negation (*med pa dgag pa*) and [that which is negated in] an implicative negation (*ma yin pa dgag pa*). As to the non-implicative negation, [it is applied to] negate the propounding of external objects as [real] entities by ordinary people and Śrāvakas. As to the implicative negation, [it is applied to] negate what is propounded by the Mind-Only [school], which [posits] self-cognition as the absolute.
>
> [The third point], what is to be established [in the form of] a positive determination, has two [subpoints]: 'being like illusions' and 'having no substratum.' [The establishment of phenomena as] being like illusions is the negation of the true existence of appearances (*snang ba'i dngos po*) and in its place the establishment of [their] mere illusory [nature]. [The establishment of phenomena as] having no substratum is the negation of the position maintaining the true existence of appearances and then—without even maintaining a mere illusory [nature in their regard]—[attempting to establish that they] have no substratum.

[53] *Grub mtha' bstan pa'i sgron me* (A, 176.5–177.5; B, 264.3–265.3).

(b) Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda versus Prāsaṅgika–Svātantrika

The question as to whether Apratiṣṭhānavāda is to be equated with Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka and Māyopamavāda with Svātantrika-Madhyamaka, or whether both are to be subsumed under Svātantrika-Madhyamaka, was answered differently by different scholars, who, in this regard, can be generally divided into two groups. The first one, including Rog Shes rab 'od and Klong chen pa (1308–1364), subsumed both Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda under Svātantrika-Madhyamaka, whereas the second, including mKhas pa lDe'u (13th cent.), bCom ldan Rig pa'i ral gri (1227–1305),[54] sTag tshang lo tsā ba,[55] mKhas grub rje (1385–1438) (followed by other dGe lugs scholars),[56] and Mi pham rNam rgyal rgya mtsho (1846–1912), identified Māyopamavāda with Svātantrika-Madhyamaka and Apratiṣṭhānavāda (or at least a branch of it) with Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka. In the following I shall first cite Rog Shes rab 'od's presentation, where Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda are subsumed under Svātantrika-Madhyamaka, and provide an overview of the division as presented by Klong chen pa, who, however—unlike Rog Shes rab 'od—further subdivides each of the two (referred to by him as respectively 'lower' and 'higher' Svātantrika-Madhyamaka). Then, as

---

54 For a summary of bCom ldan Rig pa'i ral gri's treatment of the two branches of Madhyamaka, see below in the concluding paragraph of this section.

55 *Grub mtha' kun shes kyi rnam bshad* (141.22–144.9).

56 See Seyfort Ruegg 1981: 58–59, n. 174, where reference to mKhas grub rje's understanding of this subclassification is made. According to him, Māyopamavāda is the school of Śāntarakṣita and Haribhadra (i.e. Yogācāra-Madhyamaka), and Apratiṣṭhānavāda that of Candrakīrti (i.e. Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka). See also Seyfort Ruegg 2000: 33–35, n. 60, concerning the view of other dGe lugs scholars, including 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa Ngag dbang brtson 'grus (1648–1721/22) and lCang skya Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717–1786), and other Tibetan scholars, such as Go rams pa bSod nams seng ge (1429–1489), Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507), and 'Ba' ra ba rGyal mtshan dpal bzang (1310–1391). See also Seyfort Ruegg 1981: 31–32, n. 58, for further references.

representative of the second group, I shall present mKhas pa lDe'u's and Mi pham's partitioning of Madhyamaka, followed by Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer's (1136–1204) explanation of these two strands of Madhyamaka and that of the further subdivisions of Apratiṣṭhānavāda. At the conclusion of this section I shall present a summary of bCom ldan Rig pa'i ral gri's treatment of Madhyamaka, which in my view reflects the diversity of opinion among Tibetan scholars on this issue and gives a general overview of some of the points of contention.

Rog Shes rab 'od states the following:[57]

> [As to] the fourth general point, [namely,] the object of application (*'jug yul*) of inference (*rjes dpag: anumāna*), there are two [approaches]: *svatantra* and *prasaṅga*. The difference between the two [is as follows]: the mere elimination of faults, namely, doubts regarding one's own autonomous view, is *svatantra*, while the refutation of others' theses is *prasaṅga*. Among [those who employ] *svatantra* [there are] two [strands]: Māyopama[vāda] and Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda]. The difference between the two [is as follows]: That [strand] which, in determining negatively, negates the negandum and then, in determining positively, affirms that the [nature of phenomena] is like delusive illusions is Māyopama[vāda]. That [strand] which negates [the existence of] real entities from the perspective of a negative determination and has no thesis whatsoever from the perspective of a positive determination is Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda]. These two are Svātantrika-[Madhyamaka]. Prāsaṅgika-[Madhyamaka] takes no stance of its own but refutes [whatever is] posited by others as absolute. By what means is it refuted? [It] is refuted by means of the five kinds of logical reasoning (*rigs pa: yukti*)[58] shown above.

[57] *Grub mtha' bstan pa'i sgron me* (A, 189.2–190.3; B, 275.2–276.2).

Klong chen pa's scheme can be summarised as follows:[59]

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Madhyamaka</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Svātantrika-Madhyamaka</td><td rowspan="11">Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Māyopamavāda
= Lower Svātantrika
(rang rgyud ’og ma)</td><td colspan="2">Apratiṣṭhānavāda
= Higher Svātantrika
(rang rgyud gong ma)</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.</td><td>sGyu ma rigs grub tu ’dod pa</td><td>1.</td><td>Kun rdzob rab tu mi gnas pa</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">2.</td><td rowspan="2">sGyu ma ltar snang du ’dod pa</td><td>2.</td><td>rGyu mtshan mi gnas pa</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.</td><td>lDog cha mi gnas pa</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.</td><td>sGyu ma tsam por ’dod pa</td><td>4.</td><td>lDog byed mi gnas pa</td></tr>
<tr><td>...</td><td>[rnam grangs rab tu mang]</td><td>5.</td><td>gCig mi gnas pa</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="5"></td><td>6.</td><td>Du ma mi gnas pa</td></tr>
<tr><td>7.</td><td>gCig dang du ma dang bral ba mi gnas pa</td></tr>
<tr><td>8.</td><td>sNang tsam rab tu mi gnas pa</td></tr>
<tr><td>...</td><td>[rnam grangs dpag tu med pa]</td></tr>
</table>

The subclassification of Madhyamaka as proposed in the *Theg mchog mdzod* (vol. 1: 125.1–126.5)

mKhas pa lDe'u and Mi pham, who equate Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka with a branch of Apratiṣṭhānavāda, divide Madhyamaka as follows:

58 Rog refers here to the five syllogisms (*gtan tshig: hetu*) he has just discussed in the previous paragraph. See the *Grub mtha' bstan pa'i sgron me* (A, 177.5ff.; B, 265.3ff.). The five syllogisms presented by him include the common group of four (great) syllogisms (see above, n. 21), and in addition 'negation of arising in terms of existence and nonexistence' (*yod med skye* (*ba*) *'gogs* (*pa*)).

59 Compare Almogi 2009: 475–483, where other divisional schemes drawn up by Klong chen pa are presented in the context of a discussion of various conceptions of Buddhahood.

Madhyamaka		
Māyopamavāda	Apratiṣṭhānavāda	
	1.	sTong pa rab tu mi gnas pa
	2.	rGyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa
	3.	bTang snyoms rab tu mi gnas pa
	4.	Zung 'jug rab tu mi gnas pa[60] = Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka

The subclassification of Madhyamaka as proposed in the *lDe'u chos 'byung* (119.16–20) and *bKa' brgyad rnam bshad* (33.1–35.5)

This second scheme is also found in the *gSang sngags lung gi bang mdzod*, a *gter ma* text said to has been discovered by Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer, and one of the main sources for Mi pham's *bKa' brgyad rnam bshad*. This text is one of the few that attempt to explain the difference between the further subdivisions of Apratiṣṭhānavāda found in Tibetan sources:[61]

> Madhyamaka is [of] two [kinds]: (I) Māyopamādvaya[vāda] and (II) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda]:
> (I) [For] Māyopamādvayavāda, Madhyamaka proper (*don gyi dbu ma*) is freedom from the four extremes.[62] As regards the view of

60 As noted by Seyfort Ruegg, two of the four branches of Apratiṣṭhānavāda named here, namely, Zung 'jug rab tu mi gnas pa and rGyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa, were also listed by sGam po pa as subdivisions of this branch. See Seyfort Ruegg 2000: 35.

61 *gSang sngags lung gi bang mdzod* (141.6–146.4).

62 An alternative interpretation of the sentence is possible: "Māyopamādvayavāda is the Madhyamaka [school] proper (*don gyi dbu ma*), [in that it posits] freedom from the four extremes." In later Tibetan sources, Madhyamaka came to be subclassified broadly into 'Madhyamaka of content, that which [can] be expressed' (*brjod bya don gyi dbu ma*) and 'Madhyamaka of words, that which expresses' (*rjod

*Māyādvaya[vāda], it maintains that there are no external entities out beyond cognition (or mind), [this] by way of refuting the position of the Alīkākāravāda [branch] of Yogācāra according to which [the manifold appearances caused by] residual impressions [implanted in] the mind can be described neither as being identical with it (i.e. the mind) nor as being something different [from it], while a perfect nature that is momentary is the absolute. [Query:] Well, how does [it, for example,] postulate (i.e. explain) white and red appearances? [Response:] [It] maintains that these appearances appear on account of residual impressions as mere illusion. Further, given that [they] have been caused by a condition, namely, self-cognition, they are [considered] to be non-arisen.

Moreover, it accepts two [kinds of truth or modes of reality, namely,] (1) absolute and (2) conventional:

(1) The conventional is of two [types]: (i) false conventional and (ii) efficacious (or functional) conventional. (i) The false [conventional] is like the appearance of two [moons that arise] from [one] moon. Although it (i.e. the second moon) appears, it is not efficacious. (ii) The efficacious conventional is endowed with four characteristics: it has arisen from causes and conditions; it is efficacious; it appears in a similar manner (i.e. to individuals sharing the same form of existence with the same non-erroneous sense of perception); and if it is examined it [is found to] be empty.[63]

(2) The absolute is of two [types]: (i) quasi-absolute truth (*paryāyaparamārthasatya*) and (ii) absolute truth proper (*niṣpary-*

---

byed tshig gi dbu ma). See, for example, Mi pham's *dBu ma rgyan 'grel* (78.6–79.2).

63 Compare Rong zom pa's *lTa phreng 'grel pa* (324.11–13): *de la yang dag pa'i kun rdzob ni | dngos po' rgyu rkyen las skyes pa | mthun par snang ba | don byed nus pa | brtags na dben pa'i mtshan nyid can rnams so ‖ log pa'i kun rdzob ni | snang du 'dra' yang de ltar don byed mí nus pa rnams so ‖*.

āyaparamārthasatya). (i) Quasi-[absolute truth]: By applying the four kinds of logical reasoning (*rigs pa: yukti*)[64] to the subject of a thesis (*chos can: dharmin*), [any] absolute entity (*yang dag pa'i dngos po*) [can] be rejected, and so [phenomena] are established as mere illusions. [As to the term *paramārthasatya* (*don dam pa'i bden pa*):] because [quasi-absolute truth] is the object of correct gnosis, it is called 'absolute'; because it is non-erroneous and non-deceptive, it is called 'truth.' As to [the term] *paryāya* (*rnam grangs*), it refers to deconstructive logical reasoning. (ii) Absolute truth proper: If visual perception has not arisen, it [simply] has not arisen. When [it] has arisen, [it] has arisen in the form of visible matter. Visible matter is [in essence] of the nature of visual perception. Since visual [perception] is accompanied by images of visible matter, it is said to be 'with images.' Even though [the visual perception] is accompanied [by images of visible matter, the visible matter itself] is empty of real entities. Thus appearances [of visible matter and the like] do not cease, and [they continue to] appear in the form of mere illusions. And as they (i.e. phenomena) [are considered to] be one, [inasmuch as they are all like illusions, this school of thought] is called Māyopamādvaya[vāda].

As regards being free from the four extremes: [The Māyopamavāda's view] is free from the extreme of eternalism because [it proposes that phenomena are] empty of true [existence]; it is free from the extreme of annihilationism because [it proposes that phenomena, which] are empty and yet appear, are unceasing; it is free from the extreme of [postulating] both [eternalism and annihilationism] because [it proposes that] the same [phenomena that] appear in the form of mere illusions are also devoid of true existence; it is free

---

[64] For a recent brief discussion of the four kinds of logical reasoning along with references to primary and secondary literature, see Wangchuk 2009: 217–218.

from the extreme of [postulating] neither of the two because [it proposes that phenomena can]not be established as neither of the two through [the negation of] both. The *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* states:[65]

> As [we] do not [claim that] the various [phenomena are characterised by] eternalism,
> [And] do not propound annihilationism,
> [Or] neither eternalism nor annihilationism either.
> [Our position] is free from the four extremes.

The explanation of the position of Māyopamādvaya[vāda] is [herewith] concluded.

(II) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda] has four [divisions]: (1) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] emptiness, (2) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] extinction, (3) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] equanimity, and (4) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] the union [of appearance and emptiness].

(1) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] emptiness postulates that the absolute and the conventional are separate. That is, [for it] the various appearances are conventional reality, and [thus] are deceptive and untrue appearances. On the absolute level, [phenomena are postulated as] being free from all extremes of manifoldness. [It is also] postulated that these entities are utterly nonexistent (*gtan nas*

---

[65] This verse is not found in Śāntarakṣita's *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* (or in Ratnākaraśānti's *Madhyamālaṃkāropadeśa*). Compare, however, Āryadeva II's *Jñānasārasamuccaya* 28 (as in Mimaki 2000: 241), where the expression *catuṣkotivi-nirmukta* (*mtha' bzhi las grol*) is employed in a similar context. The verse is also found in Jetāri's **Sugatamatavibhaṅgakārikā* (P, 64b7–8; D, 8a3; S, vol. 63: 885.7–8, where the Tibetan reads *mtha' bzhi dag las nges grol ba*), and in Atiśa's **Dharmadhātudarśanagīti* (P, 271a7–8; D, 256b2–3; S, vol. 26: 1665.10–12, where the Tibetan reads *mtha' bzhi yang ni nges grol bas*).

med pa), just as whatever [apparently] substantial entities (*rdzas kyi dngos po*) that exist in a dream, for example, are utterly nonexistent after one has awakened. The *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* states:[66]

> In virtue of [having realised] emptiness, one is released.
> If one does not realise it, one is bound.

And:

> What is the absolute [reality] of all phenomena like?
> [The Buddha] declares: [It is] emptiness.

(2) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] extinction postulates that as long as conceptual thoughts exist, [their] antidote—the accumulation of gnosis (*jñānasambhāra*)—also exists, but once conceptual thoughts are exhausted, even the term gnosis no [longer] exists. For example, it is like [charcoal]: as long as charcoal is present, [the colour] white does not occur.[67]

(3) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] equanimity [postulates the following]: The preceding views rest on the extremes of false imputation and depreciation: That is, the Śrāvaka [system] has falsely imputed the object-subject dichotomy. [Māyopamavāda] has suc-

---

[66] These verses are not found in the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*. What is expressed in them is, however, widely familiar. Regarding the first two lines, compare, for example, *Hevajratantra* 1.1.11ab. See also Wangchuk 2007: 199–200.

[67] This analogy does not seem apt. As pointed out above, the usual analogy in this context is that of fire and wood (or fuel), which stand for gnosis and conceptual thoughts, respectively, in the sense that as long as there is fuel there is fire, and once the fuel is exhausted the fire, too, dies out. The analogy based on charcoal and the colour white seems to be used in the case of two things that are mutually exclusive. For such an instance, see Mi pham's *'Od gsal snying po* (110.6): ... *sol ba bkrus kyang mi dkar ba* .... One could, of course, interpret the analogy here in the sense that as long as charcoal has not been exhausted by fire, the colour white (referring in this case to the colour of the ash it leaves behind), would not appear. However, apart from the fact that I have not been able to locate an instance of such an analogy in this sense, it would still not serve the intended purpose.

cumbed to depreciation, inasmuch as [it] postulates that [phenomena], like illusions, are empty of an own-nature, [while it] has falsely imputed [existence to a logically attestable] illusory [nature]. The Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] emptiness has succumbed to depreciation in [postulating that phenomena] do not exist even as mere illusions; [and it] has falsely imputed [existence to utter] empti[ness].[68]

(4) Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda that emphasises] the union[69] [of appearance and emptiness postulates as follows]: Cognitions (or cognitive entities) have no substratum (*yongs su gnas pa med pa* = *rab tu mi gnas pa*). Appearances have no true existence [even] when one's self-cognitive mind appears in the form of an [endless] cycle of dependent arising. As truly existent entities are not attestable [they can]not be held to be false [either]. [And it] proposes no thesis whatsoever. The *Candrapradīpa* (i.e. *Samādhirājasūtra*) states:[70]

> No one, [not even] an intelligent [person],
> Would be able to challenge
> A view that contains no proposition,[71]
> [Propounding] neither existence, nonexistence, [both] existence and nonexistence, nor neither [of the two].

---

[68] One wonders why no reference is made here to the views of Yogācāra and rGyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa, both of which clearly fall under the category of views 'lower' than that of bTang snyoms rab tu mi gnas pa in Nyang ral's presentation. Moreover, one would naturally expect here that the Śrāvakas, too, would be accused of some kind of depreciation.

[69] Note that the text erroneously reads here '*apratiṣṭhāna* of equanimity.'

[70] I was not able to locate this verse in the *Samādhirājasūtra*. It is, nonetheless, clearly an allusion to *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* 68 and *Catuḥśataka* 16.25, for which see Ichigō 1989: 212, 213.

[71] Note the usage of the phrase *khas len gyi lta ba yod med* by Rig ral in the same context in the passage paraphrased below.

> Having refuted the [claim that] appearances are truly existent, *Madhyamaka-Māyopamavāda maintains that illusion (or illusory nature) is attestable on the basis of logical reasoning. This is untenable: As far as illusion is concerned, any characteristic (*mtshan nyid ci yin*) [attributed to it that is allegedly] attestable on the basis of logical reasoning [can] be logically invalidated (*rigs pas gnod pa*). [Objection: The position according to which] the cognitive subject that postulates that appearance is truly [existent] is attestable on the basis of logical reasoning is not refutable on the basis of logical reasoning. [Reply:] Well, in that case it needs to be asked whether illusion is existent from having arisen or existent from not having arisen, employing thereby [the logical reasoning of] 'vajra slivers/fragments' (*rdo rje gzegs ma*) [and the following line of argument]: Is appearance existent on account of [its] having arisen or [its] not having arisen? If [Māyopamavāda] states that it is called an illusion on account of its having arisen and [of its nevertheless being] nonexistent, it could be analogously stated (*mgo bgre*) that it is also called an appearance on account of [its] having arisen and [of its nevertheless being] nonexistent.

The supposed differences between these and other subdivisions of the two branches of Madhyamaka certainly need further investigation. Worth mentioning here, however, is the fact that Nyang ral explains rGyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa as the branch that maintains that gnosis exists as an antidote as long as conceptual thoughts exist, but once the latter come to an end, even the term 'gnosis' ceases to exist. This could certainly be taken as descriptive of Apratiṣṭhānavāda as understood by Rong zom pa. Also worth mentioning is that a number of bKa' brgyud scholars, such as Padma dkar po (1527–1592), reportedly characterised the distinction between Sūtric and Tantric Mahāyāna as paralleling that between Rab tu mi gnas

pa and Zung 'jug rab tu mi gnas pa.[72]

Lastly, I would like to summarise the main points of bCom ldan Rig pa'i ral gri's treatment of Madhyamaka in his *Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog*, which attempts to address some of the issues surrounding the Tibetan controversy regarding this Madhyamaka divide. Rig ral first divides Madhyamaka into Svātantrika-Madhyamaka and Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka, and then adds that these are also called (*zer*) Māyopama-[vāda] and Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda]. He goes on to list several differences (as obviously claimed by others) between the two branches—namely, that they differ over whether they postulate the existence or nonexistence of gnosis at [the stage of] a *buddha*; whether they accept or reject hypostatic existence on the conventional level; whether they do or do not have a thesis (*khas len gyi lta ba yod med*, lit. "whether they do or do not have a view [statable in terms] of propositions"); regarding the number of [types of] valid cognition [accepted by them]; whether they do or do not postulate that all objects are false and all minds are deluded; whether or not they postulate subdivisions of the conventional; whether they consider the absolute to be [characterisable in terms of] a non-implicative negation or freedom from manifoldness; and so forth—but then rejects the idea that one can differentiate between them on the basis of these criteria, since this approach would be inconclusive and even misleading. He refrains, however, for reasons of space, from discussing the matter in more detail. In the end, according to him, the basic distinction between the two lies in [the type of] syllogism [employed] (i.e. *svatantra* or *prasaṅga*).[73] After addressing this point and citing from several authoritative Indian works, he goes on to state that what are called Māyopama[vāda] and Apratiṣṭhāna[vāda] in the Mahāmudrā [system] of Maitrīpa and elsewhere are in fact nothing but

---

[72] See, for example, the discussion by dGe 'dun rin chen (1926–1997), the Sixty-ninth rJe mKhan po of Bhutan, in his *gSung lan dus gi pho nya* (466.1–465.2).

[73] *Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog* (391.1–6).

these two systems (i.e. Svātantrika-Madhyamaka and Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka). This scheme, he opines, simply reflects a shift of emphasis: Svātantrika-Mādhyamikas, when expounding on [reality,] tend to [emphasise] the illusory [nature of phenomena], while Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamikas tend to [emphasise] freedom from manifoldness, [which means that] not even the illusory [nature of phenomena] has a substratum. Both of them set out to establish the illusory nature [of phenomena] on the basis of logical reasoning, and therefore saying that sGyu ma rigs grub [pa] (i.e. Māyopamavāda, the school according to which this illusory [nature] is attestable on the basis of logical reasoning) is inferior (*ngan pa*) is [an expression of] ignorance (*mi shes pa*).[74] After providing several citations from authoritative works, he continues by arguing that the claim by some that there are Mādhyamikas who postulate that the illusory [nature of phenomena] is the absolute truth is nothing but a superficial evaluation (*'ol tshod*), for if [this illusory nature] is transient, then [the claim that it is] the absolute cannot hold, whereas if it is not transient, then [the claim that it is] illusion-like would not hold; any postulation of the dependent [nature] on the absolute level would, moreover, conform to the system of the Substantialists. He further argues that the exposition found in some scriptures according to which the illusion-like [nature] is the absolute refers to the quasi-absolute (*rnam grangs pa'i don dam*). Therefore, he concludes, all Mādhyamikas are in agreement inasmuch as they postulate that the absolute is freedom from manifoldness.[75]

5. Concluding Remarks

From what we have seen in the above-cited sources it can be said that the treatment of the Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda divide by both Indian

[74] *Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog* (393.6–394.5).
[75] *Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog* (396.2–6).

scholars and their Tibetan successors, while often addressing similar questions and points of contention, was by no means homogeneous. What one can, however, say is that Māyopamavāda is normally presented by Apratiṣṭhānavāda as a Madhyamaka school that attempts to positively determine the illusion-like nature of phenomena, while Apratiṣṭhānavāda is commonly said not only to reject such an attempt but, in addition, not to take a position at all in regard to the absolute (some, though, state that they positively determine phenomena, as being substratumless). Nonetheless, since all Indian sources cited above present the matter from the Apratiṣṭhānavādin viewpoint, one wonders whether there was anyone at all who considered himself a Māyopamavādin—that is, in the sense portrayed by their Apratiṣṭhānavādin 'opponents'—or whether the entire 'controversy' and 'debate' took place, at least initially, within Apratiṣṭhānavāda circles alone with (more or less) imaginary opponents. Whatever the case, this subclassification of Madhyamaka is certainly a late one, and apparently confined to a small circle of primarily Tantric Indian masters. This scheme therefore seems—possibly because institutionalised Buddhism on the Indian subcontinent was virtually coming to an end—to have never had the chance to undergo proper systematisation in India or to be systematically subjected to refutation by its opponents. Tibetans therefore inherited this doxographical scheme in a very rudimentary form, to say the least. And although they commonly attempted to systematise and harmonise whatever apparently conflicting doctrines they did inherit, we see in our case an unusually vehement rejection on the part of some Tibetan scholars, despite the fact that the scheme is found in several Indian sources. One possible explanation stems from the fact that the Indian proponents of this scheme, being strongly inclined towards Tantric teachings, did not enjoy much authority among Tibetan masters more inclined towards non-Tantric teachings. What is undoubtedly certain is that this scheme not only did not conform (at least not in an obvious manner)

with the widely accepted subclassification of Madhyamaka during the first propagation period of Buddhism in Tibet (i.e. that into Sautrāntika-Madhyamaka and Yogācāra-Madhyamaka), but it also appeared to relegate highly revered masters such as Śāntarakṣita and other Yogācāra-Mādhyamikas to the inferior Māyopamavāda branch, which was, at least for some, unacceptable (the same could be said, though, in regard to the Svātantrika–Prāsaṅgika divide). Moreover, this scheme did not seem to correlate any more straightforwardly with the new partitioning of Madhyamaka into Svātantrika-Madhyamaka and Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka, which finally gained the upper hand in Tibet (the nature of this latter scheme, to be sure, has also remained, to a certain degree, a matter of debate).

One of the main points of contention, and one reason for the vehement rejection, is no doubt the fact that most (later) Tibetan authors seem to have taken the difference between Māyopamavāda and Apratiṣṭhānavāda to refer to their allegedly divergent postulations regarding the absolute. The claim that a Mādhyamika would postulate some kind of existence on the absolute level was no doubt unacceptable in their view. However, there remains the question of whether this was indeed the case. As I have shown in my above-mentioned study on various conceptions of Buddhahood—which, broadly speaking, can be subsumed under two groups: on the one hand, a conception of Buddhahood according to which the stage of a *buddha* comprises the purified *dharmadhātu* alone, and on the other, several conceptions that propose that the stage of a *buddha* comprises, in addition, other elements (such as non-conceptual gnosis, pure mundane gnosis, *buddha*-Bodies, bliss, and the like)—Rong zom pa convincingly shows that these different conceptions of Buddhahood refer to the conventional level and not to the absolute level. That is, the first conception is ascribed to Mādhyamikas who do not seem to follow any of the Yogācāra theories of knowledge for their postulation of the conventional level, while the

remaining conceptions are ascribed to Mādhyamikas who follow one of the Yogācāra theories of knowledge towards that end. Moreover, the first group is associated with Apratiṣṭhānavāda, and the second with Māyopamavāda. Provided that Rong zom pa's understanding of the nature of the Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda divide (which is clearly supported by some Indian and early Tibetan sources) reflects the initial state of affairs, one wonders what would have been the reason for this cleft. I have already pointed out that Rong zom pa's presentation of the controversy surrounding the constituents of Buddhahood and its connection with the Yogācāra theories of knowledge on the one hand and to the Māyopamavāda–Apratiṣṭhānavāda divide on the other is unique in its scope and grasp of the issue, not only in comparison to discussions found in other Tibetan sources but also to ones that took place in India. However, as pointed out earlier, the recent publication of the so-called *bKa' gdams gsungs 'bum* has revealed that Rong zom pa was not alone in his views on the Madhyamaka stance on Buddhahood and other issues, and presumably one is likely to find early material therein that will shed more light on the matter and help us answer at least some of the many open questions. It cannot be ruled out that Rong zom pa, at one end of the scale, is representative of highly sophisticated attempts at clarification and systematisation of the issue, which unfortunately fell into oblivion, whereas later authors, at the other end, reflect unawareness of such efforts, and certainly not of the epistemological issues underlying this divide.

Appendix

(a) Aśvaghoṣa/Śūra

**Paramārthabodhicittabhāvanākrama* (P, 18a6–b4; D, 16a3–7[76]; S, vol. 64:

[76] *The recto of the wooden block of fol. 16 in* D *was apparently damaged, since in several cases portions of letters are missing, the most likely explanation being that bits of the wood had broken off prior to printing.*

46.8–47.3):

gal te grub pa mtha' yas pa'i ‖
gnod pa 'di la rab tu 'du ‖
des na ma brtags nyams dga' ste ‖
sgyu ma tsam la brtags pas bslus ‖ (1)
sems ni sgyu ma'i rnam pa ste ‖
byang chub kyang ni sgyu ma 'dra ‖
des kyang tshig[77] tu brjod spangs te ‖
spros bral 'jam[78] dpal mthong ba min ‖ (2)
sgyu ma sgyu ma tsam min te ‖
gal te yin na de mi grub ‖
grub na gzhan gyi gzhung lugs kyang ‖
sgyu ma'i chos su thal bar 'gyur ‖
de phyir sgyu ma'i rang bzhin ni ‖
sgyu bzhin 'di zhes brjod[79] du med ‖ (3)
‹'on kyang›[80] thugs rje ldan pa yis ‖
bden pa gnyis kyi tshul gnas te ‖
tha snyad don la rab brten nas ‖
bdag[81] med seng ge'i sgra[82] chen bsgrags ‖ (4)
stong pa nyid sogs rnam grangs sgo ‖
sgyu ma 'dra sogs dpe mtha 'yas ‖
theg pa sna tshogs thabs tshul gyis ‖
mi gnas dbu ma nye bar mtshon ‖ (5)

---

77 tshig] P, tsheg D (*the upper part of the gi gu seems to have broken off*)

78 'jam] P, 'ngam D (*the middle stroke of ja seems to have broken off*)

79 brjod] P, brngod D (*the middle stroke of ja seems to have broken off*)

80 'on kyang] D, 'di yang P

81 *The upper part of the letter da in* D *is not visible* (*apparently having broken off*).

82 *The right-hand stroke of the superscript* sa *in* D *is not visible* (*apparently having broken off*).

mtshon kyang mtshon bya ma yin te ‖
'di la bsal bya ci yang med ‖
stong pa nyid kyang stong pas stong ‖
'di la sangs rgyas sems can med ‖ (6)
bdag gzhan snang zhing srid pa'i chos ‖
rnam grol rnam par bcings pa yang ‖
ming tsam ming yang yod ma yin ‖
thams cad nam mkha' dang 'dra ste ‖ (7)
de ltar chos rnams mthong med na ‖
mi mngon mi snang 'jam dpal mthong ‖
skye dang ˂'chi ba'i srid pa˃[83] yi ‖
'khor ba'i rgya mtsho pha rol 'gro ‖ (8)

(b) Candraharipāda

**Ratnamālā* (P, 69a6–7; D, 71a4; S, vol. 63: 1045.12–14):
brtags[84] pa'i yang dag bkag pa yis[85] ‖
shugs la rang rig sgyu ma'i lus ‖
rigs[86] dpyad yod med mtha' las grol ‖
ma brtags nyams dga' bem[87] rig gnyis ‖

**Ratnamālā* (P, 69a8–b1; D, 71a5–6; S, vol. 63: 1045.17–1046.1):
snang srid sgyu ma lta bu la ‖
ye shes sangs rgyas sgyu ma la ‖
sgyu ma rigs[88] pas grub na ni ‖

---

83 'chi ba'i srid pa] P, srid pa'i 'chi ba D
84 brtags] D, btags P
85 yis] D, yi P
86 rigs] D, rig P
87 bem] P, bems D
88 rigs] D, rig P

sgyu ma ma yin yang dag thal‖
mi ’gyur sgyu mar grub ce na‖
rigs grub don ni yang dag min‖
sgyu ma’i ming gis ci byar yod‖
de yang dngos ’dzin gdon las ni‖
ma ’das pa ru mkhas rnams ’dod‖

（c）**Jñānavajra**

**Tattvamārgadarśana*（P, 148a5–8; D, 133a7–b2; S, p. vol. 41: 356.7–12):
de yang spyod lam khyad par med par dus gsum du lnga char[89] ’dod la lta ba la khyad yod de| sbyor dngos mjug gsum mdo sde pas rten ’brel du ’dod la| rnam bcas sems kyi rnam par ’dod| rnam med pas[90] bzang rtog tu ’dod la|[91] sgyu ma lta bus sgyu ma lta bur ’dod|[92] rab tu mi gnas pas kun rdzob yin gyi don dam ma yin te| rmi lam lta bu mi bden par snang bar ’dod de| don dam la khas len med pa’o‖ gzhan don dam du ’dod pa’o‖.

（d）**Advayavajra**

**Apratiṣṭhānadeśakavṛtti*（P, 235a5–8; D, 215b4–6; S, vol. 26: 1536.8–16):
rigs pa gang zhe na| bdag nyid chen po rnams kyis sngon du legs par bkod pa’i gang dag yod par grags pa’i chos thams cad[93] rten cing ’brel par ’byung ba tsam las byung ba’i phyir| sgyu ma lta bu’o zhes bya ba dang| de nyid kyis don dam par na rang dang[94] gzhan dang gnyis ka dang rgyu med pa las skye ba nam yang mi ’thad pa’i phyir don[95] dam par nam mkha’i padma lta

---

89 char] D, car P
90 pas] D, dpas P
91 |] D, ‖ P
92 |] D, ‖ P
93 cad] D, cad| P
94 dang] D, dang| P
95 don] P, dan D

bu'o[96] zhes bstan pa 'di kho nas chog ste | shes rab kyi mig dang ldan pa rnams kyis rang bzhin gyi[97] gtan tshigs 'di kho na'i sgo nas drang por zhib tu bltas na | mthar ci yang grub pa ma rnyed pas | chos thams cad rab tu mi gnas par grub[98] pa'o ‖.

(e) **Vajrapāṇi**

**Guruparamparākramopadeśa* (P, 184b6–185a3; D, 164b4–165a1; S, vol. 41: 446.10–447.13):[99]

rim gyis 'jug pa'i dbang du byas na theg pa ni gsum ste | nyan thos kyi theg pa dang | rang sangs rgyas kyi theg pa dang | theg pa chen po'o ‖ theg pa gsum ni gnas pa bzhi la gnas te | gnas pa bzhi ni bye brag tu smra bar gnas pa dang | mdo sde par gnas pa dang | rnal 'byor spyod par gnas pa dang | dbu ‹ma par›[100] gnas pa'o ‖ nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas ni bye brag tu smra ba la gnas so ‖ bye brag tu smra ba la yang gnyis te | nub phyogs bye brag tu smra ba dang | kha che bye brag tu smra ba'o ‖ nyan thos la gsum ste | dbang po tha ma dang | 'bring dang |[101] rab bo ‖ de la tha ma dang 'bring po ni ‹nub phyogs›[102] bye brag tu smra ba la gnas so ‖ rab dang rkyen rtogs[103] ni kha che bye brag tu smra ba[104] la gnas so ‖ theg[105] pa chen po[106] la yang gnyis te | rgyu mtshan nyid kyi[107] theg pa dang | 'bras bu rdo

96 bu'o] D, bu'o ‖ P
97 gyi] D, gyis P
98 grub] P, ma grub D
99 *This passage has not been translated but rather paraphrased.*
100 ma par] D, mar P
101 |] P, *om.* D
102 nub phyogs] P, nub phyogs kha che D
103 rtogs] *em.*, rtog PD
104 ba] D, *om.* P
105 theg] P, thig D
106 po] D, *hardly legible in* P *due to excessive ink*
107 kyi] D, kyis P

rje'i theg pa'o ‖ de la rgyu mtshan nyid kyi theg pa la gsum ste | tha ma dang | 'bring dang | rab bo ‖ tha ma ni mdo sde pa'o ‖ 'bring ni rnal 'byor spyod pa'o ‖ rab ni dbu ma pa'o ‖ rnal 'byor spyod pa la gnyis te | rnam pa dang bcas pa[108] dang | rnam pa med pa'o ‖ dbu ma pa la yang gnyis te | sgyu ma lta bu gnyis su med par smra ba dang | chos thams cad rab tu mi gnas par smra ba'o ‖

**Guruparamparākramopadeśa* (P, 189a3–b6; D, 168a7–169a1; S, vol. 41: 456.11–457.19):[109]
da ni sgyu ma lta bu'i gzhung bshad par bya ste |
[[«yod min med min yod[110] med min ‖ gnyis ka min pa'ang ma yin pa ‖ mtha' bzhi las ni rnam grol ba ‖ de nyid dbu ma pa yis rig ‖ [111]»[112] ces bya bas |[113] yod pa ma yin pa ni gcig dang du ma'i sbyor bas gnod pa'i phyir ro ‖ med pa ma yin pa ni snang ba nyams su myong ba yod pa'i phyir ro ‖ gnyis ka ma yin pa ni gnyis ka la skyon[114] yod pa'i phyir ro ‖ gnyis ka ma yin pa yang ma yin pa ni rgyu med pa mi srid pa dang | phung po gsum pa med pa'i phyir ro ‖]]
de bas na mtha' bzhi las grol ba'i sgyu ma lta bu'i shes pa 'od gsal bar 'dod ‹do ‖ ›[115] de yang mya ngan las 'das pa'i chos kyang sgyu ma lta bu rmi lam lta ‹bu la›[116] mya ngan las 'das pa las ches lhag pa'i chos yod na yang de yang[117] sgyu ma lta bu rmi lam lta bu'o zhes gsungs pas | sna tshogs dang

---

108 pa] P, ma D
109 *The text within* [[...]] *has not been translated.*
110 yod] D, lod P
111 ‖] D, *om.* P
112 *This is a citation of* Tattvaratnāvalī 25 (6.13–14); Tib. (P, 129a4; D, 118a7–b1; S, vol. 26: 343.2–3).
113 |] D, ‖ P
114 skyon] D, skon P
115 do ‖] P, de | D
116 bu la] P, bu D

sems nyid sgyu ma lta bur gnyis su med pa ni so sor rtog pa'o ‖ sna tshogs thams cad chu zla'am me long gi gzugs brnyan ltar bden pa ma yin la brdzun pa yang ma yin par sgyu ma lta ‹bur gnyis›[118] su med par 'jog[119] pa ni sgom[120] pa'o ‖ [121] chad par zhen pa ni sgom pa'i dri ma'o ‖ sgyu ma lta bu'i shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pas[122] pha rol tu phyin pa lnga mi dmigs pa gsum gyis 'khor gsum yongs su dag par byas[123] nas sems can gyi don byed pa ni lta ba'o ‖

gzhan yang chos thams cad rab tu mi gnas[124] pas sgyu ma lta bu nyid ma grub par 'dod de | [125] de yang 'di skad du |

gsal lam mi gsal yang rung ste ‖
sus kyang ji bzhin ma mthong bas ‖
mo gsham gyi ni bu bzhin du ‖
brjod du zin kyang don med de ‖

zhes bya bas sgyu ma lta bu nyid 'od gsal lam | 'on te sems las gzhan zhe na |

sems las gzhan pa'i chos ni ma grub la | sems nyid yin na sems nyid ma grub pa'i dus su sgyu ma nyid kyang mi 'grub bo ‖ de ci'i phyir zhe na | sems nyid las gzhan med pa'i phyir ro ‖ sgyu ma lta bu yang mi mkhas[126] pa'i shes pa ste | sgro 'dogs skur pa 'debs pa ste | dper na skyes bu ‹mig ma dag pas›[127] mig nam mkha' la bltas na mig ma dag pa'i stobs kyis zla ba

---

117 yang] D, yar P
118 bur gnyis] D, *mostly defaced* P
119 'jog] P, 'jig D
120 sgom] P, bsgom D
121 ‖] D, | P
122 pas] D, pa yis P
123 byas] *em.*, spyad PD.
124 gnas] P, dmigs D
125 |] D, *om.* P
126 mkhas] D, °s *defaced in* P
127 mig ma dag pas] *em.*, ma dag pas PD. *Cf. the reading in the parallel passage*

gnyis pa dang | skra'i 'khor lo la sogs pa snang zhes sgro 'dogs la mkhas pa'i shes pas snang ma thag tu med par shes te | med do zhes skur pa 'debs so ‖ de bzhin du sgyu ma lta bu yang las dang ma rig pa'i dbang gis sna tshogs su snang ngo zhes sgro btags la | mkhas pa'i stobs kyis[128] snang ma thag tu stong ste | sgyu ma lta bu zhes skur pa 'debs so ‖ de bas na sgro 'dogs pa dang[129] skur pa 'debs pa'i mtha' la gnas so ‖

**Guruparamparākramopadeśa* (P, 189b6–190b5; D, 169a1–b5; S, vol. 41: 457.20–459.21):[130]

de nas gzhan yang chos thams cad rab tu mi gnas par[131] smra bar 'dod[132] pas

[['di skad du | «sna tshogs rtag pa ma yin te ‖ [133] chad par yang ni khas mi len ‖ rtag dang chad pa gnyis ka dang ‖ gnyis ka min pa'ang ma yin no ‖ 'dir ni thams cad mi gnas par ‖ dngos po'i de nyid mkhas pas rig ‖ des na 'di lta'i rnam rtog gi ‖ sems ni sems kyis rig ma yin ‖ ji srid sgro 'dogs thams cad ni ‖ de kun thams cad du med pas ‖ dbu ma'i don la sgro 'dogs med ‖ des na dgag dang sgrub pa med ‖»[134] ces bya ba dang | gzhan nas kyang | «'di la ‹bsal bya›[135] ci yang med ‖ gzhag par bya ba gang yang med ‖ yang dag nyid la yang dag blta[136] ‖ yang dag mthong na rnam par grol ‖»[137] zhes

---

below: skye bo mig dag pa.

[128] kyis] D, *defaced in* P

[129] dang] D, dang | P

[130] *The text within* [[...]] *has not been translated.*

[131] par] *em.*, pa'i mthar PD

[132] 'dod] *em.*, 'dong D, *defaced in* P

[133] ‖] D, | P

[134] *This is a citation of* Tattvaratnāvalī 27–29 (6.23–7.1) (P, 129a8–b2; D, 118b3–5; S, vol. 26: 343.13–19).

[135] bsal bya] D, gsal ba P

[136] blta] P, lta D

[137] *This is a citation of* Abhisamayālaṃkāra 5.21 (= Ratnagotravibhāga 1.154). *For further references and a translation, see Wangchuk 2007, pp. 199-200, n. 11; Almogi*

bya bas]]

yod pa'i sgro 'dogs dang med pa'i skur pa 'debs pa la mi gnas te | sems nyid sna tshogs su ‹snang ba nyams su›[138] myong ba nyid rten cing 'brel par 'byung bas na ma skyes pa ste | ma skyes pa nyid skye ba ltar snang ste | skye ba dang skye ba med pa gnyi ga tha mi dad do ‖ de bzhin du snang ba nyid rigs pas brtags na stong pa yin la | stong pa ma grub pa rigs pas brtag mi bzod pa nyid snang ba'o ‖ snang ba nyid las kyang stong pa gzhan ma yin la | stong pa nyid[139] las kyang snang ba gzhan ma yin no ‖ dper na smig rgyu la chur snang ba nyid la chu yis stong la | chu med pa nyid chur snang ste | chur snang ba dang chu med pa gnyis tha dad pa ma yin no[140] ‖ de bzhin du snang ba nyid na rang bzhin med ‹la |›[141] rang bzhin med pa nyid snang ba'o ‖ snang ba dang rang bzhin med pa stong pa nyid ni tha mi[142] dad ‹do ‖›[143] dper na bud shing du ma mes bsregs na me'i ngo bor gcig ste | de nas bud shing zad pa dang me nyid mi gnas so ‖ de bzhin du sna tshogs su snang ba nyid rigs pas stong pa nyid du byas nas dngos po ma grub pa dang stong pa nyid kyang mi gnas so ‖ de bzhin du gnyis su mi gnas pa yang gnyis su ma grub pa'i tshe[144] na gnyis su med pa yang mi 'grub bo ‖ de bas na gzhan gyi zhen pa bzlog ‹pa 'am›[145] | sgro skur gcad[146] ‹pa 'am›[147] | ‹drang ba'i›[148] don du stong pa dang skye ba med pa zhes brjod kyi | mkhas

---

2009: 312.

[138] snang ba nyams su] P, *om.* D

[139] nyid] D, *om.* P

[140] no] P, na D

[141] la] D, pa ‖ P

[142] mi] P, me D

[143] do ‖] D, de | P

[144] tshe] P, che D

[145] pa 'am] P, pa'am D

[146] gcad] D, bcad P

[147] pa 'am] P, pa'am D

[148] drang ba'i] P, drad pa'i D

pas btsal[149] ‹pa 'am›[150]| nges pa'i don du de[151] nyid mi gnas te| rnam gcod dang| yongs gcod dang| sgro 'dogs dang|[152] skur pa 'debs pa yang mi gnas la| zhen pa med cing dgag pa dang|[153] sgrub pa med la[154] mnyam gzhag dang rjes thob gnyis su med cing mi gnas pa ni so sor rtog pa'o‖ sgro skur dang zhen pa med par yid la byed pa med pa ni sgom pa'o‖ don thams cad chad par lta zhing nyams su myong ba med pas bems por gyur pa ni sgom pa'i dri ma'o‖ sgro skur med pa dang| zhen pa med pa'i shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pas pha rol tu phyin pa lnga mi dmigs pa gsum gyis 'khor gsum yongs su dag pas sems can gyi don byed pa ni lta ba'o‖ dper na skye bo mig dag pa mkhas pa ‹mig gis›[155] nam mkha' la ‹bltas pas›[156] mig dag pas skra'i[157] 'khor lo la sogs pa ci yang mi dmigs la| mkhas pas yod ces bya ba'am med ces bya bar sgro 'dogs ‹pa 'am›[158] skur pa 'debs par mi byed do‖ de bzhin du chos thams cad rang bzhin du ma skyes pa'i ngo bo nyid kyis yod med gang yang mi gnas pas yod med kyi sgro skur gang[159] du yang mi gnas pa ni de kho na nyid kyi shes pa'o‖ sgyu ma lta bu dang rab tu mi gnas pa'i snying rje yang dmigs pa med pa'i snying rje ste| chos thams cad cir yang mi dmigs par yid la byed pas na mi dmigs pa'i snying rje'o‖

149 btsal] D, gcal P
150 pa 'am] P, pa'am D
151 de] P, di D
152 |] D, *om.* P
153 |] D, *om.* P
154 la] D, la| P
155 mig gis] P, cig D
156 bltas pas] P, lta ba na D
157 skra'i] D, sgra'i P
158 pa 'am] P, pa'am D
159 gang] P, gad D

(f) Atiśa (ascribed)

bKa' gdams bu chos (160.9–16):

de la gnyis| dbu ma dang| sems tsam mo‖ dbu ma la gnyis te| snang ba tsam gyi dbu ma dang| rab tu mi gnas pa'i dbu ma'o‖ snang ba tsam gyi dbu ma ni| chos rdzun pa yin pa rdzun par gtan la 'bebs te| rmi lam la sogs pa sgyu ma'i dpe brgyad kyis bstan no‖ de yang bstan bya ston byed gnyis ka 'khrul ba'i yul dang yul can yin pas spang bya yin la shes par bya dgos so‖ rab tu mi gnas pa'i dbu ma ni| sangs rgyas rnams byon yang rung| ma byon yang rung| chos rnams kyi chos nyid ye nas mi gnas par gsungs pas| blang bya yin la shes par bya dgos so‖ sems tsam la gnyis te| snang ba bden par smra ba dang| rdzun par smra ba'o‖ de dag gnyis car rab tu mi gnas pa'i dbu ma la ltos te 'khrul ba yin la shes par ni bya dgos|

(g) Gro lung pa Blo gros 'byung gnas

bsTan rim chen mo (437b7–438a3):

yang blun po kha cig dbu ma'i lugs gnyis te| rab tu mi gnas pa dang sgyu ma lta bur smra ba'o‖ slob dpon zhi ba 'tsho la sogs pa ni sgyu ma don dam pa bzhed pa ste| dngos po smra bas btags pa bden pa bkag nas brdzun pa yongs gcod rigs pas bsgrub pa kho na'o zhes zer ba ni ci 'ang ma yin te| dbu ma'i rgyan nyid las|

de phyir dngos po 'di dag ni‖
kun rdzob pa nyid mtshan nyid 'dzin‖
gal te don dam 'di 'dod na‖
de la bdag gis ci byar yod‖

ces rdzun pa de snang ba'i yul tsam du gsungs la| skye ba dgag pa dgag bzhis bsdus pa'i yongs gcod ni log pa'i kun rdzob nyid du gsungs pa'i phyir dang| yod pa'am med pa'ang rung 'ga' zhig rigs pas gnas par smra na mthar lta ba'i gdon chen pos zin pas dbu ma'i lam las thag ring ba nyid do‖ yod na nges par rtag par zhes bya ba la sogs pa gsungs pa'i phyir ro‖

(**h**) **Phywa pa Chos kyi seng ge**

gZhung rnam 'byed (65.6–67.2):

don dam pa'i bden pa la yang kha cig bden pas stong pa'i snang ba[160] sgyu ma lta bur smra ba dang| ma yin dgag tu bden pa gang du yang rab tu mi gnas par smra ba'i lugs gnyis yod zer ba ni mun sbrul gyi bshad pa ste| sgyu ma lta bur smra ba rab tu mi gnas par[161] smra ba las[162] lugs gzhan du brjod pa de (a) bden pas[163] stong par[164] khas mi len pas[165] lugs gzhan yin nam|[166] (b) snang ba[167] ma yin dgag tu khas len pas lugs gzhan yin|[168] (a) dang po ltar na sgyu ma lta bur smra bas bden pas stong par khas mi len na de snang ba[169] sna tshogs par khas len par 'gal bas sgyu ma lta bu nyid kyang khas mi len par ‹thal lo›[170]‖ (b) gnyis pa ltar na (i) snang ba[171] ma yin dgag pa tsam khas len pas[172] rab tu mi gnas pa las[173] lugs gzhan yin nam (ii) snang ba ma yin ‹dgag de›[174] dpyad bzod du khas len pas rab tu mi gnas pa las lugs gzhan yin| (i) dang po ‹ltar na›[175] rab tu mi gnas par smra ba nyid kyang rab tu mi gnas pa las lugs gzhan du 'gyur te| snang ba[176] ma yin

---

160 ba] *em., text reads* pa
161 par] *em., text reads* pa'i
162 las] *em., text reads* la
163 pas] *em., text reads* pa
164 par] *em., text reads* pa
165 pas] *em., text reads* pa
166 |] *em., text reads* ‖
167 ba] *em., text reads* pa
168 |] *em., text reads* ‖
169 ba] *em., text reads* pa
170 thal lo] *exp., text reads* thalo
171 ba] *em., text reads* pa
172 pas] *em., text reads* par
173 las] *em., text reads* la
174 dgag de] *em., text reads* te dgag
175 ltar na] *em., text reads* ltar
176 ba] *em., text reads* pa

‹dgag de›[177] tsam khas len pa'i ‹phyir ro›[178] ‖ khas mi len na kun rdzob la skur pa 'debs pas rgyang ‹'phen pa›[179] ltar chad par 'gyur te | des ma mthong ba[180] bkag pa ltar 'dis mthong ba[181] nyid kyang bkag pa'i phyir ro ‖ (ii) gnyis pa ltar na sgyu ma lta bur smra ba dpyad bzod 'di pa ma yin dgag khas len pas dngos por[182] smra ba dang tha dad ‹med par›[183] 'gyur ro ‖

rab tu mi gnas pa yang sgyu ma lta bur smra ba las lugs gzhan du brjod na |[184] (a) sgyu ma khas mi[185] len pa'am (b) sgyu ma dpyad bzod du khas mi len pas lugs gzhan yin | (a) dang po ltar na rab tu mi gnas pas[186] kun rdzob ‹thams cad›[187] mi 'dod pas ‹rgyang 'phen pas›[188] kyang smad par bya bar 'gyur te | rgyang 'phen[189] pas kun rdzob kyi phyogs gcig[190] la skur[191] pa btab pa yin la rab tu mi gnas pas kun rdzob ‹thams cad›[192] la skur ba btab pa'i phyir ro ‖ (b) gnyis pa ltar na sgyu ma ltar smra ba nyid kyang sgyu ma ltar smra ba nyid[193] las tha dad du 'gyur te |[194] sgyu ma dpyad bzod par khas len pa'i phyir ro ‖ dpyad bzod du khas len na bden pa'i snang ba[195] yin

---

[177] dgag de] *em., text reads* te dgag

[178] phyir ro] *exp., text reads* phyiro

[179] 'phen pa] *em., text reads* phan phar

[180] ba] *em., text reads* pa

[181] ba] *em., text reads* pa

[182] *The final* r *is added below the syllable* po.

[183] med par] *em., text reads* par

[184] |] *em., text reads* ‖

[185] *The syllable* mi *is added below the line of writing.*

[186] pas] *exp., text reads* pa

[187] thams cad] *exp., text reads* thaṃd

[188] rgyang 'phen pas] *em., text reads* rgyas pa bas

[189] 'phen] *em., text reads* phan

[190] gcig] *em., text reads* cig

[191] skur] *em., text reads* bskur

[192] thams cad] *exp., text reads* thaṃd

[193] *The text inserts here* kyang sgyu mar smra ba.

[194] |] *em., text reads* ‖

[195] ba] *em., text reads* pa

pas sgyu ma'i don mi gnas la| snang ba[196] dpyad bzod[197] par 'dod pas dngos por smra ba dang yang tha dad med par 'gyur ro‖ ‹de bas na›[198] dbu ma ba ‹thams cad›[199] kyis sgyu ma lta bu nyid ni dpyad[200] par mi 'dod pas| cir yang ma grub pa kho na dpyad bzod par 'dod pa la tha dad gtan med pa yin no‖

(i) Rog Shes rab 'od

Grub mtha' bstan pa'i sgron me (A, 176.5–177.5; B, 264.3–265.3):
gnyis pa rnam bcad[201] dgag bya la gnyis te| spyi dang| bye brag go‖ dang po dgag bya spyi'i mtshan nyid ni| dngos po 'am| dngos med kyang rung ste| rigs[202] pas dpyad[203] nas[204] rang bzhin gyi khyad par 'ga' zhig dang ldan par 'dod pa gang rnyed pa de dgag bya yin no‖ ‹dgag bya›[205] la bye brag tu phye na gnyis te| med pa dgag pa dang| ma yin pa dgag pa'o‖ med pa dgag pa ni| so so skye bo dang| nyan thos pa| phyi rol gyi don dngos por 'dod pa 'gogs la| ma yin pa dgag pa ni| sems tsam rang rig don dam du 'dod pa 'gogs pa'o‖.

yongs gcod[206] bsgrub bya la gnyis te| sgyu ma lta bu| rab tu mi gnas pa'o‖ sgyu ma lta bu ni| snang ba'i dngos por bkag nas| shul du sgyu ma

---

[196] ba] *em.*, *text reads* pa

[197] *The text inserts here* du khas len na bden pa'i snang ba yin pas sgyu ma'i don mi gnas la| snang ba dpyad bzod, *obviously due to a skip of the eye to the previous sentence.*

[198] de bas na] *em.*, *text reads* de bas

[199] thams cad] *exp.*, *text reads* thaṃd

[200] dpyad] *em.*, *text reads* spyad

[201] bcad] *em.*, gcod A, gcad B

[202] rigs] B, rig A

[203] dpyad] *em.*, spyad AB

[204] nas] B, na A

[205] dgag bya] B, dag ga A

[206] gcod] A, spyod B

tsam cig[207] sgrub pa'o ‖ rab tu mi gnas pa ni | snang ba'i dngos por 'dod pa bkag nas sgyu ma tsam du yang mi 'dod de rab tu mi gnas pa'o ‖

Grub mtha' bstan pa'i sgron me (A, 189.2–190.3; B, 275.2–276.2):
spyi don bzhi pa rjes dpag gi 'jug yul la gnyis te | rang rgyud dang | thal 'gyur ro ‖ de gnyis kyi khyad par ni | rang rgyud kyi lta ba la dogs pa'i skyon sel tsam cig[208] rang rgyud yin la | gzhan gyi khas len 'gogs pa de thal 'gyur ro ‖ rang rgyud la gnyis te | sgyu ma lta bu dang | rab tu mi gnas pa'o ‖ de gnyis kyi khyad par yang | rnam bcad[209] kyi dus su dgag bya bkag nas | yongs gcod[210] la rdzun pa'i[211] | sgyu ma lta bur khas len pa ni | sgyu ma lta bu'o ‖ rnam bcad[212] la bden pa'i dngos po bkag nas | yongs gcod[213] la khas len gang yang med pa ni rab tu mi gnas pa'o ‖ de gnyis rang rgyud do ‖ thal 'gyur ni | rang gi khas len gang yang med pa la | gzhan gyis yang dag tu khas len pa 'gogs[214] pa'o ‖ de gang gis 'gogs na | gong du bstan pa'i rigs pa lnga pos 'gogs so ‖

(j) **Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer**
gSang sngags lung gi bang mdzod (141.6–146.4):
dbu ma la gnyis te[215] ¦ (I) sgyu ma ltar gnyis su med pa dang ¦ (II) rab tu mi gnas pa'o ¦

(I) ‹142› sgyu ma ltar gnyis su med par smra ba ni ¦ mtha' bzhi dang bral ba don gyi dbu ma'o ¦ sgyu ma gnyis med kyi lta ba ni ¦ sems tsam

207 cig] A, gcig B
208 cig] A, gcig B
209 bcad] *em.*, dpyad AB
210 gcod] *em.*, dpyod AB
211 pa'i] A, pa'am B
212 bcad] *em.*, dpyad AB
213 gcod] *em.*, dpyod AB
214 'gogs] B, 'gog A
215 te] *em.*, *text reads* ste

rnam rdzun gyis[216] sems nyid kyi bag chags dang¦ de nyid dang gzhan du brjod du med pa dang don dam yongs grub skad cig mar ’dod pa bkag nas ’di shes pa las ma gtogs[217] pa phyi rol gyi don med par ’dod pa de¦ ’o na dkar dmar gyi snang ba ’di ji ltar ’dod zhes na¦ snang ba ’di nyid bag chags kyi dbang gis¦ sgyu ma tsam du snang bar ’dod¦ de yang rang rig pa’i rkyen las bskyed pa’i phyir ma skyes pa ces bya’o¦

de yang (1) don dam (2) kun rdzob gnyis su ’dod de¦

(1) kun rdzob la yang gnyis¦ (i) log pa’i kun rdzob dang| (ii) don byed pa’i kun rdzob bo[218]¦ (i) log pa ni zla ba las gnyis su snang ba lta bu ste¦ snang yang don byed mi nus pa’o¦ (ii) don byed pa’i kun rdzob ni¦ mtshan nyid bzhi dang ldan pa ste¦ rgyu rkyen las skyes pa¦ don byed nus pa| mthun par snang ba¦ brtags na dben pa’o¦

(2) don dam la gnyis¦ (i) rnam grangs kyi don dam pa’i bden pa dang¦ (ii) rnam grangs ma yin pa’i don dam pa’i bden pa’o¦ (i) rnam grangs ni¦ gtan tshig bzhi chos can la bzhag pas¦ yang dag pa’i ‹dngos po›[219] bcad nas¦ sgyu ma tsam du bsgrub pa’o¦ ye shes dam pa’i yul du gyur pas don dam pa zhes bya’o¦ ma nor mi slu bas bden pa ces bya’o¦ rnam grangs ni ’joms[220] byed kyi rigs[221] pa la ‹143› bya’o¦ (ii) rnam grangs[222] ma yin pa’i[223] don dam pa’i bden pa ni¦ mig gi rnam par shes pa ma skyes na ma skyes¦ skyes na gzugs su skyes¦ gzugs mig gi rnam par shes pa’i ngo bo yin¦ ‹mig gzugs›[224] gzugs kyi rnam pa dang bcas pas[225]

---

[216] gyis] *em.*, *text reads* gyi
[217] gtogs] *em.*, *text reads* rtogs
[218] bo] *em.*, *text reads* so
[219] dngos po] *em.*, *text reads* dngos
[220] ’joms] *em.*, *text reads* ’jam
[221] rigs] *em.*, *text reads* rig
[222] grangs] *em.*, *text reads* pa
[223] pa’i] *em.*, *text reads* pa
[224] mig gzugs] *exp.*, *text reads* migzugs
[225] pas] *em.*, *text reads* pa

rnam[226] bcas¦ zhes bya'o¦ bcas bzhin du yang dag pa'i dngos por stong pas snang ba ma 'gags te[227]¦ sgyu ma tsam du snang ba yin la¦ de gnyis su med pas sgyu ma gnyis med zhes bya'o¦

mtha' bzhi las grol lugs ni¦ yang dag pa'i stong pas rtag[228] pa'i mtha' dang bral¦ stong zhing snang ba ma 'gags pas chad pa'i mtha' dang bral¦ sgyu ma tsam du snang ba nyid yang dag gi dngos por stong pas gnyis ka'i mtha' dang bral¦ gnyis ka bas gnyis med ma grub pas¦ gnyis med kyi mtha' dang bral¦ dbu ma rgyan las¦

sna tshogs rtag[229] pa ma yin pas¦
chad pa yang ni khas mi len¦
rtag chad gnyis ka ma yin pas¦
mtha 'bzhi las ni yongs su grol¦

ces 'byung ngo¦ sgyu ma ltar gnyis su med pa'i 'dod pa bshad zin no¦

(II) rab tu mi gnas pa la bzhi ste¦ (1) stong pa rab tu mi gnas pa¦ (2) rgyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa| (3) btang snyoms rab tu mi gnas pa¦ (4) zung 'jug rab tu mi gnas pa

(1) stong pa rab tu mi gnas pa ni¦ don dam dang kun rdob tha dad du 'dod pa ste¦ snang pa sna tshogs 'di kun rdzob kyi bden pa 'khrul pa'i snang ‹144› ba mi bden pa'o¦ don dam pa na spros pa'i mtha' thams cad dang bral ba'o¦ dper na rmi lam rdzas kyi dngos po ci yod pa las¦ sad nas gtan med pa bzhin¦ dngos po 'di gtan nas med par 'dod¦ mngon par rtogs pa'i brgyan las¦

stong pa nyid kyis grol bar 'gyur¦
de ma shes na 'ching[230] bar 'gyur¦

[226] rnam] *em.*, *text reads* rnams
[227] te] *em.*, *text reads* ste
[228] rtag] *em.*, *text reads* rtags
[229] rtag] *em.*, *text reads* btags
[230] 'ching] *em.*, *text reads* 'chi

zhes pa dang¦

chos thams cad kyi yang dag pa ji lta bu lags¦

bka' stsal pa stong pa nyid¦

zhes pa'o¦

(2) rgyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa ni¦ ji srid rnam rtog yod kyi bar du¦ gnyen po ye shes kyi tshogs kyang yod la¦ rnam rtog zad nas ye shes kyi ming yang med par 'dod do¦ dper na sol ba ma zad na dkar po mi yong pa ltar ro¦

(3) btang snyoms rab tu mi gnas pa ni¦ de man chad kyi lta ba sgros btags dang¦ skur 'debs kyi mtha' la gnas te[231]¦ nyan thos kyis[232] gzung 'dzin du sgros btags¦ sgyu ma lta bur rang bzhin gyis[233] stong par 'dod pa pa skur ‹pa btab›[234]¦ sgyu ma sgros btags¦[235] stong pa rab tu mi gnas pas sgyu ma tsam du yang med ces skur pa btab¦ stong pa sgros btags so¦

(4) ‹zung 'jug›[236] rab tu mi gnas pa ni¦ blo yongs su gnas pa med de[237]¦ snang ba rang gi sems kyi rang rig rten 'brel gyi 'khor lo sna tshogs su snang ba'i dus na bden pa'i dngos ‹145› po ma grub¦ bden pa'i dngos po ma grub pas[238] rdzun par mi 'dzin¦ khas gang du yang mi len te¦ zla ba sgron ma las¦

yod dang med dang yod med med¦

khas mi len pa'i lta ba la|

de la blo dang ldan pa ni¦

sus kyang klan ka bya mi nus¦

zhes 'byung ngo¦

---

231 te] *em., text reads* ste

232 kyis] *em., text reads* kyi

233 gyis] *em., text reads* gyi

234 pa btab] *em., text reads* par btags

235 btags¦] *em., text reads* btags

236 zung 'jug] *em., text reads* btang snyoms

237 de] *em., text reads* ste

238 pas] *em., text reads* pa'i

dbu ma sgyu ma lta bu ni¦ snang pa yang dag du 'dod pa bkag nas¦ sgyu ma[239] rig pas bsgrub par 'dod de[240] mi 'thad[241] de¦ sgyu ma ni mtshan nyid ci yin rigs[242] pas grub la¦ rigs[243] pas gnod pa'o¦ snang ba[244] dag su 'dod pa'i blo yang¦ rigs[245] pas grub pa la rigs[246] pa mi gnod pa la bya'o¦ 'on snang ba[247] skyes nas ‹grub bam›[248] ma skyes pas grub zer nas rdo rje gzegs ma gtong na¦ sgyu ma skyes nas grub pam¦ ma skyes pas grub bya'o¦ skyes[249] nas ma grub des na sgyu ma zhes bya'o¦ zhes zer na¦ skyes[250] nas ma grub pa des snang ba[251] yang ces bya'o zhes mgo bgre'o[252]¦

(k) **Rig pa'i ral gri**

Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog (391.1–6):

de 'dra'i dbu mar smra ba la‖
rang rgyud pa dang thal 'gyur gnyis‖
de la sgyu ma lta bu dang‖
rab tu mi gnas zhes kyang zer‖

'di gnyis kyi khyad par sangs rgyas la ye shes yod med du 'dod pa'am kun rdzob la bden pa khas len mi len nam khas len gyi lta ba yod med dam tshad ma'i grangs mang nyung ngam yul thams cad rdzun pa dang blo thams cad

---

[239] ma] *em.*, *text reads* mar
[240] de] *em.*, *text reads* ste
[241] 'thad] *em.*, *text reads* thad
[242] rigs] *em.*, *text reads* rig
[243] rigs] *em.*, *text reads* rig
[244] ba] *em.*, *text reads* pa
[245] rigs] *em.*, *text reads* rig
[246] rigs] *em.*, *text reads* rig
[247] ba] *em.*, *text reads* pa
[248] grub bam] *exp.*, *text reads* grubaṃ
[249] skyes] *em.*, *text reads* spyad
[250] skyes] *em.*, *text reads* spyad
[251] ba] *em.*, *text reads* pa
[252] bgre'o] *em.*, *text reads* bgri'o

'khrul par 'dod mi 'dod dam kun rdzob la dbye ba 'dod mi 'dod dam don dam med dgag dang spros bral la byed pa la sogs pa tsam gyis ni khyad par mi phyed de ma khyab pa dang 'khrul pa'i[253] phyir ro ‖ de rgyas par bshad na ni shin tu mang por 'gyur ro ‖ 'on kyang 'di gtan tshigs kyi dbye ba yin no ‖

Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog (393.6–394.5):
mai tri pa'i[254] phyag rgya bzhi la sogs pa nas sgyu ma lta bu dang rab tu mi gnas pa zhes 'byung ba de'ang 'di gnyis yin te rang rgyud pa rnams ni sgyu ma lta bu shas cher 'chad la | thal 'gyur ba ni sgyu ma tsam mi gnas pa'i spros bral shas cher 'chad pas shas che chung la btags pa yin no ‖ 'di gnyis ka sgyu ma lta bu ni rigs pas sgrub pa yin te ... des na sgyu ma rigs grub ngan pa yin no zhes zer ba ni mi shes pa yin no ‖

Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog (396.2–6):
kha cig gis sgyu ma lta bu don dam pa'i bden par 'dod pa'i dbu ma pa yod ces zer ba de ni 'ol tshod kho na yin te brtags pas 'jig na don dam yin pa nyams la | mi 'jig na sgyu ma lta bu nyams pa'i phyir dang | gzhan dbang don dam du 'dod pa dngos po smra ba'i lugs yin pa'i phyir ro ‖ gzhung 'ga' zhig las sgyu ma lta bu la don dam zhes bshad pa de ni rnam grangs pa'i don dam yin no ‖ de'i phyir dbu ma pa thams cad don dam spros bral la 'dod par mthun par yin no ‖

---

253 pa'i] *em., text reads* ba'i

254 pa'i] *em., text reads* ba'i

Sigla and Bibliography

1. Sigla

A & B See *Grub mtha' bstan pa'i sgron me*.

D sDe dge *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*. Numbers according to Hakuju Ui et al., eds., *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons* (*Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur*). Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University, 1934.

P Peking *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*. Numbers according to Shoju Inaba et al., *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition. Catalogue & Index*, Reduced-size edition. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1985.

S *bsTan 'gyur* (*dpe bsdur ma*). Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1994–2005.

2. Primary Sources

a. Indian Sources

**Apratiṣṭhānadeśakavṛtti* Advayavajra, **Sarvadharmāpratiṣṭhānadeśakatattvārthagāthāvṛtti*.
—Tib. P3144; D2296; S1204, vol. 26.

**Dharmadhātudarśanagīti* Atiśa, **Dharmadhātudarśanagīti*.
—Tib. P3153; D2314; S1216, vol. 26.

**Guruparamparākramopadeśa* Vajrapāṇi, **Guruparamparākramopadeśa*.
—Tib. P4539; D3716; S2414, vol. 41.

Hevajratantra *Śrīhevajramahātantrarāja*.
—In *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study. Part 2: Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*, ed., D. L. Snellgrove. London Oriental Series 6. London: Oxford University Press, 1959: 1–101.

Paramārthabodhicittabhāvanākrama Aśvaghoṣa/Śūra, **Paramārthabodhicittabhāvanākrama*.
—Tib. P5308; D3912; S3141, vol. 64.

**Ratnamālā* Candraharipāda, **Ratnamālā*.
—Tib. P5297; D3901; S3130, vol. 63.

**Sugatamatavibhaṅgakārikā* Jetāri, **Sugatamatavibhaṅgakārikā*.
—Tib. P5296; D3899; S3128, vol. 63.

**Tattvamārgadarśana* Jñānavajra, **Tattvamārgadarśana*.
—Tib. P4538; D3715; S2413, vol. 41.

Tattvaratnāvalī Advayavajra, *Tattvaratnāvalī*.
—Skt. H. Ui (ed.), *Tattvaratnāvalī*. *Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyu Kiyou* (*The Journal of the Faculty of Nagoya University*) 3.1, 1950: 1–31.
—Tib. P3085; D2240; S1146, vol. 26.

Tattvaratnāvaloka Vāgīśvarakīrti, "Tattvaratnāvalokaḥ with Vivaraṇa of Mahāpaṇdita-Vāgīśvarakīrti." *Dhīḥ* 21 (1996): 129–149.

Yuktiṣaṣṭikā Nāgārjuna, *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*.
—In Chr. Lindtner (ed. & tr.), *Master of Wisdom: Writings of the Buddhist Master Nāgārjuna, Translation and Studies*. Revised edition of 1986. Berkeley: Yeshe De Project, Dharma Publishing, 1997: 72–93 (Tibetan text and English translation), 174–175 (Sanskrit fragment).

b. Tibetan Sources

bKa' brgyad rnam bshad Mi pham rNam rgyal rgya mtsho, *dPal sgrub pa chen po'i bka' brgyad kyi spyi don*

rnam par bshad pa dngos grub snying po. In *MS*, vol. 21: 1–207.

bKa' gdams bu chos — *'Brom ston pa rgyal ba'i 'byung gnas kyi skyes rabs bka' gdams bu chos*. In *Jo bo'i gsung 'bum*. Ed. dPal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2006: 157–591.

bSlab pa gsum gyi rgyan gyi me tog — bCom ldan rig pa'i ral gri, *bSlab pa gsum gyi rgyan gyi me tog*. In *bCom ldan rigs* [sic] *pa'i ral gri'i gsung 'bum*. 10 vols. [Lhasa: Khams sprul bSod nams don grub, 2006], vol. 4 (*nga*): 258–439. [scans: TBRC: W00 EGS1017426]

bsTan rim chen mo — Gro lung pa Blo gros 'byung gnas, *bDe bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa rin po che la 'jug pa'i lam gyi rim pa rnam par bshad pa*. Lhasa: Zhol par khang, [1800s].

dBu ma rgyan 'grel — Mi pham rNam rgyal rgya mtsho, *dBu ma rgyan gyi rnam bshad 'jam dbyangs bla ma dgyes pa'i zhal lung*. In *MS*, vol. 13 (nga): 1–359.

dKon cog 'grel — Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po, *sGyu 'phrul gsang ba snying po'i rtsa rgyud tshul bzhi yan lag bco lngas bkral ba dkon cog 'grel*. In *RZChZSB* under the title *rGyud rgyal gsang ba snying po dkon cog 'grel*, vol. 1: 31–250.

Grub mtha' bstan pa'i sgron me — Rog Shes rab 'od, *Grub mtha' so so'i bzhed tshul gzhung gsal bar ston pa chos 'byung grub mtha' chen po bstan pa'i sgron me. A*

Detailed Survey of Comparative Siddhanta in the Context of Mahāyāna Buddhism and in Particular the rÑiṅ-ma-pa Tradition of Tibet. Edited from a Tibetan Blockprint by the Ven. 'Khor-gdong gTer-sprul 'Chi-med-rig-'dzin. Ladakh: Tshul khrims 'jam dbyangs, 1977. [=A]

—In *bKa' ma shin tu rgyas pa*. Compiled and edited by mKhan po 'Jam dbyangs. 120 vols. Chengdu, 1999, vol. 114: 105–315. [scans: TBRC: W25983-4019][=B]

Grub mtha' kun shes kyi rnam bshad sTag tshang lo tsā ba Shes rab rin chen, *Grub mtha' kun shes nas mtha' bral sgrub pa zhes bya ba'i bstan bcos rnam par bshad pa legs bshad kyi rgya mtsho*. In Tshul khrims rgyal mtshan, ed., *Grub mtha' kun shes kyi rtsa 'grel*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1999: 26–230.

Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog bCom ldan rig pa'i ral gri, *Grub mtha' rgyan gyi me tog*. In *bCom ldan rigs* [sic] *pa'i ral gri'i gsung 'bum*. 10 vols. [Lhasa: Khams sprul bSod nams don grub, 2006], vol. 5 (*ca*): 102–425. [scans: TBRC: W00EGS1017426]

gSang sngags lung gi bang mdzod Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer (discovered), *gSang sngags lung gi bang mdzod*. In *bKa' brgyad bde gŚegs 'dus pa'i chos skor*. The largest version of the bKa' brgyad or "Eight Pronouncement" system of the rÑiṅ-ma-pa tradition recovered from its place of

	concealment by Myaṅ-ral Ñi-ma-'od-zer. Reproduced from the complete mTshams-brag manuscript reflecting the tradition of Goṅ-ra Lo-chen Ṅag-dbaṅ-gzhan-phan-rdo-rje. Paro, Kyichu Monastery: Ngodrup & Sherab Drimay, 1980, vol. 4: 97–178. [scans: TBRC: W22247]
gSang sngags nges par byed pa'i don	See *mDo rgyud rtogs pa'i sgron ma*.
gSung lan dus gi pho nya	dGe 'dun rin chen, *Phyag rgya chen po las brtsams pa'i dri tshig grub pa'i mdung rnon zhes bya ba'i gsung lan dus kyi pho nya*. In *bShes gnyen chen po dge 'dun rin chen mchog gi gsung 'bum*. 10 vols. Rewalsar: Sherab Gyaltsen Lama & Āchārya Shedup Tenzin, Zigar Drukpa Kargyud Institute, 1985–1991, vol. 6: 439–500.
gZhung rnam 'byed	Phywa pa Chos kyi seng ge, *bDe bar gshegs pa dang phyi rol pa'i gzhung rnam par 'byed pa*. In *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs thengs dang po*. 30 vols. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006, vol. 9: 7–73.
lDe'u chos 'byung	mKhas pa lDe'u, *rGya bod kyi chos 'byung rgyas pa*. Chief ed. Chab spel tshe brtan phun tshogs. Gangs can rig mdzod 3. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1987.
lTa phreng 'grel pa	Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po, *Man ngag lta phreng gi 'grel pa*. In *RZChZSB*, vol. 1: 303–351.

mDo rgyud rtogs pa'i sgron ma	Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer (discovered), *mDo rgyud rtogs pa'i sgron ma*. P4781, D not found; S2657, vol. 44.
MS	*'Jam mgon 'ju mi pham rgya mtsho'i gsung 'bum rgyas pa sde dge dgon chen par ma. The Expanded Redaction of the Complete Works of 'Ju Mi-pham*. Reconstructed and reproduced from the surviving prints at the order of H. H. Dilgo Chhentse Rimpoche. 27 vols. Paro: Lama Ngodrup & Sherab Drimey, 1984–1993.
'Od gsal snying po	Mi pham rNam rgyal rgya mtsho, *gSang 'grel phyogs bcu mun sel gyi spyi don 'od gsal snying po*. In *MS*, vol. 19: 1–271.
Rang byung ye shes	Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po, *Rang byung ye shes chen po 'bras bu rol pa'i dkyil 'khor du blta ba'i yi ge*. In *RZChZSB*, vol. 2: 111–130.
RZChZSB	Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po, *Rong zom chos bzang gi gsung 'bum*. 2 vols. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1999.
Theg mchog mdzod	Klong chen pa Dri med 'od zer, *Theg pa'i mchog rin po che'i mdzod*. In *mDzod bdun*, Gangtok: Dodrup Chen Rinpoche. n. d. [Reprint: Thimphu: National Library of Bhutan, n. d.], vols. *ca-e & cha-waṃ*.
Theg tshul	Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po, *Theg pa chen po'i tshul la 'jug pa zhes bya ba'i bstan bcos*. In *RZChZSB*, vol. 2: 415–555.
Thugs rje spyan thag gi gnas	See *mDo rgyud rtogs pa'i sgron ma*.

3. Secondary Sources

Almogi 2009 Orna Almogi, *Rong-zom-pa's Discourses on Buddhology: A Study of Various Conceptions of Buddhahood in Indian Sources with Special Reference to the Controversy Surrounding the Existence of Gnosis (jñāna: ye shes) as Presented by the Eleventh-Century Tibetan Scholar Rong-zom Chos-kyi-bzang-po*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 24. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2009.

Ichigō 1989 Masamichi Ichigō, ed. & tr., "Śāntarakṣita's Madhyamakālaṁkāra." In Luis O. Gómez & Jonathan A. Silk, eds., *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*. Michigan Studies in Buddhist Literature 1, ed. Luis O. Gómez. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, 1989: 141–240.

Kano 2007 Kazuo Kano, "rNgog Blo ldan shes rab cho Shokan kanro no shizuku: Kōtei text to naiyou gaikan" [rNgog Blo ldan shes rab's *sPrings yig bdud rtsi'i thig le*: Critical Edition and Survey]. *Kōyasan-daigaku mikkyōbunkakenkyūjokiyō* 20, 2007: 1–58.

MacDonald 2009 Anne MacDonald, "Knowing Nothing: Candrakīrti and Yogic Perception." In Eli Franco (ed.) in collaboration with Dagmar Eigner, *Yogic Perception, Meditation and Altered States of Consciousness*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009: 133–168.

Mathes 2007 Klaus-Dieter Mathes, "Can *Sūtra Mahāmudrā* Be

Justified on the Basis of Maitrīpa's Apratiṣṭhānavāda?." In Birgit Kellner, Helmut Krasser, Horst Lasic, Michael Torsten Much & Helmut Tauscher (eds.), *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ: Papers Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2007, part 2: 545–566.

Mimaki 1982 Katsumi Mimaki, *Blo gsal grub mtha': Chapitres IX (Vaibhāṣika) et XI (Yogācāra) édités et Chapitre XII (Mādhyamika) édité et traduit*. Kyoto: Université de Kyoto, Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo, 1982.

Mimaki 2000 *Idem*, "*Jñānasārasamuccaya* kk° 20–28: *Mise au point* with a Sanskrit Manuscript." In Jonathan A. Silk, ed., *Buddhist Studies: The Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao. Wisdom, Compassion and The Search for Understanding*. 2000. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2008: 233–244.

Seyfort Ruegg 1981 David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*. A History of Indian Literature 7, ed. Jan Gonda. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981.

Seyfort Ruegg 2000 *Idem*, *Three Studies in the History of Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Philosophy: Studies in Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Thought Part 1*. WSTB 50. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2000.

Wangchuk 2007 Dorji Wangchuk, *The Resolve to Become a* Buddha: *A Study of the* Bodhicitta *Concept in*

Indo-Tibetan Buddhism. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 23. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2007.

Wangchuk 2009 *Idem*, "A Relativity Theory of the Purity and Validity of Perception in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism." In Eli Franco (ed.) in collaboration with & Dagmar Eigner, *Yogic Perception, Meditation and Altered States of Consciousness*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009: 215–239.

Reseacher,
Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies
Asia-Africa Institute
Research Group "Manuscript Cultures
in Asia and Africa", University of Hamburg
Research Fellow,
International Institute for Buddhist Studies